DOCTOR OF EDUCATION (EDD)

‘Doing coaching justice’: Promoting a critical consciousness in sports coaching research

Bush, Anthony

Award date:
2008

Awarding institution:
University of Bath

‘DOING COACHING JUSTICE’: PROMOTING A CRITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN SPORTS COACHING RESEARCH

Anthony James Bush

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Education

University of Bath

Department of Education

September 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank unreservedly my supervisor Dr Mike Silk for his support, guidance and opening my eyes to the possibilities afforded by embracing a Physical Cultural Studies sensibility. I am extremely grateful to Dr Sue Martin for her help and professionalism during the initial stages of embarking on this research enquiry and for undertaking the role of critical reader of the complete research enquiry, and to Professor Hugh Lauder for his critical reading of the 'educational policy' sections. I would also like to thank my mum and dad (Pat and John) for their constant support over the last 38 years. Finally, this research enquiry is dedicated to my partner Béatrice and our beautiful daughter Charlotte Maya Bush who was born 27th February 2008.

ABSTRACT

This research enquiry is a positional paper that *locates* the context in which sports coaching research is undertaken. Embracing a physical cultural studies sensibility, the research enquiry raises critical questions about the explanatory framework guiding sports coaching research and presents a new conceptualisation for research in the 'field'. Deploying the theory and method of articulation (Hall, 1996) and Foucault's (1969) genealogical method, this research enquiry maps out the critical history of the sports coaching present through consideration of the social forces that comprise our conjunctural moment (Grossberg, 2006). By doing so, the impact of the liberal capitalist order prevalent in higher education in the United Kingdom – termed the 'proto-fascist / pernicious present' (Giroux, 2005a; Silk and Andrews, in press) – is unpacked. Within this context, the research enquiry explicates how these various social forces congeal at, meet at, and frame the practice of sports coaching research. Through mapping sports coaching research within a corporatised higher education, the dominant or legitimate forms of sports coaching knowledge are problematised. This research enquiry then posits that sports coaching research challenges the mythopoeic status afforded to the terminology 'sport' and 'coaching' and proposes that the moniker 'Physical Pedagogic Approach' (PPA) better serves the reconceptualised field. In addition, the PPA is an approach that addresses methodological fundamentalism (House, 2006), adopts a 'sacred and moral' epistemology (Christians, 2000; Christians, 2005; Denzin, 2002; Denzin, 2005), and ultimately opens up to a plurality of approaches to 'what counts' as constituting the sports coaching research landscape – the 'Physical Pedagogic Bricolage'. Through challenging the practices imposed under neoliberal ideology, the reconceptualised field is characterised by a multiperspectival process and a socially and culturally responsive, communitarian, justice-oriented agenda; in essence, the PPA is an approach that can 'do coaching justice'.

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

> Nothing can exist as an element of knowledge if, on the one hand, it does not conform to a set of rules and constraints characteristic, for example, of a given type of scientific discourse in a given period, and if, on the other hand, it does not possess the effects of coercion or simply the incentives peculiar to what is scientifically validated or simply rational or simply generally accepted … (Foucault, 1997, p.52).

This research enquiry is a response to the growing consensus that sports coaching research "needs to extend its physical and intellectual boundaries" (Potrac et al., 2007, p.34). Indeed, despite considerable research from a number of theoretical and empirical perspectives, "it is arguable that sports coaching continues to lack a sound conceptual base" (Cushion et al., 2006, pp.83-84). The aim of this research enquiry is to contextualise the current 'moment' in which sports coaching research is undertaken, and then offer a directional purview of the ontological, epistemological, and methodological boundaries – the conceptual base – of a reconceptualised 'field' of sports coaching research.

This research enquiry is framed by a Physical Cultural Studies (PCS) theoretical approach. The reconceptualised 'field' builds upon the noticeable evolution from sport to physical culture (Silk and Andrews, in press) and by mobilising a PCS sensibility, and new nomenclature, the very essence of sports coaching research is explicated. In doing so, it is hoped that the progressive potential of a 'field in tension' (Silk and Andrews, in press) can be realised, resulting in the evolution of a socially and culturally responsive, communitarian, justice-oriented agenda; in essence, an approach that can 'do coaching justice'.

In order to study and offer a reconceptualisation of a discipline or 'field' such as sports coaching, the best approach for this is to examine the workings of the discipline to develop a rigorous understanding of the ways that the discipline has traditionally operated (Kincheloe, 2001). To invoke and paraphrase Kincheloe (2001), scholarly activity in sports coaching operates in a power-saturated and regulatory manner, with disciplinarians having developed a methodical,

persistent, and well co-ordinated process of knowledge production. Although these disciplinarians have exhibited genius within these domains and great triumphs of scholarly breakthrough that have resulted in improvements in the knowledge base of sports coaching, this research enquiry will aim to make use of these positive contributions while avoiding the disciplinary parochialism and domination that limits the study in the 'field'. In essence, this research enquiry calls for questions of disciplinarity – the consistent division between disciplinarians and interdisciplinarians[1] – not to detract from the efforts to theorise the research bricolage in a reconceptualised 'field' of sports coaching.

Deploying the theory and method of articulation (Hall, 1996) and Foucault's (1969) genealogical method, this research enquiry maps out the critical history of the sports coaching present through consideration of the social forces that comprise our conjunctural moment (Grossberg, 2006) allowing the social construction of the discipline's knowledge bases, epistemologies, and knowledge production methodologies to be studied. Importantly, this genealogical context facilitates the exploration of the "discipline as a discursive system of regulatory power with its propensity to impound knowledge within arbitrary and exclusive boundaries" (Kincheloe, 2001, p. 684). By pursuing this dialectic of disciplinarity, it is envisaged that practitioners in the reconceptualised 'field' – the 'bricoleurs' – would develop a power literacy to understand the nature and effects of the web of power relations that have shaped sports coaching's official research methodologies, and also the ways that these power dynamics have shaped the knowledge produced. The alternative structure would have to be anti-essentialist, guided by the principle that "nothing is guaranteed" (Grossberg, 1992, p.53) and operate within a contextual physical cultural studies strategy where cultural forms are understood by the way in which they are *articulated* into a particular set of complex relationships that comprise the social context (Silk and Andrews, in press). Importantly, with and through articulation, "we engage the concrete in order to change it, that is, to *rearticulate* it" (Slack, 1996,

[1] Disciplinarians maintain that interdisciplinary approaches result in superficiality; interdisciplinary proponents argue that disciplinarity produces naïve over-specialisation (Kincheloe, 2001).

p.114 – emphasis added). In doing so, the 'bricoleur' in the reconceptualised or rearticulated 'field' of sports coaching:

> …becomes an expert on the relationships connecting cultural context, meaning making, power, and oppression within disciplinary boundaries. Their rigorous understanding of these dynamics possibly makes them more aware of the influence of such factors on the everyday practices of the discipline than those who have traditionally operated as scholars within the discipline (Kincheloe, 2001, p.684).

St. Pierre and Roulston (2006, p.674) argue that the politics of this historical 'moment' have qualitative researchers concerned that qualitative inquiry is under siege and that some in positions of power have either never heard or choose now to ignore the victory narrative of the paradigm wars of the 1980s. This victory narrative is one in which qualitative inquiry cleared a space for itself and became legitimate. The 'moment' – termed our 'proto-fascist present (Giroux, 2005) or the 'pernicious present' (Silk and Andrews, in press) – means that qualitative research exists in a time of global uncertainty (Denzin et al., 2006) where government agencies are attempting to regulate scientific enquiry by defining what counts as 'good' science (Denzin et al., 2006). 'Good' science is based on the desire for research that is replicable, generalisable, empirical and experimental, which results in 'scientifically based research' (SBR) or evidence-based research (EBR) being heralded as the gold standard for research practices[2].

The 'moment' is shaped by the dominant political and ideological form of capitalist globalisation – neoliberalism – which due to the global hegemony of this mode of rationality, has become omnipresent and a commonsense of the times (Brenner and Theodore, 2002a; Peck and Tickell, 2002). Neoliberalism is *everywhere* and has been referred to as a "new religion" (Peck and Tickell, 2002, p.381) and through the adoption of the neoliberal policy agenda, the contemporary higher education system is a 'locality' in a globalised world that demonstrates subservience to commercialisation, vocationalisation, privatisation, militarisation, marketisation and managerialism. This rise in 'corporate power' (Giroux, 1999), 'governmentality' (Olssen and Peters, 2005) and an 'audit

[2] See St. Pierre (2006) for a review of scientifically based research in education.

culture' (Frith, 2001) has impacted on the core functions of universities and the academic community. It is within this context that academics have seen their sports coaching research guided by the controlling yardstick of profit, their knowledge instrumentalised, and responsibility diverted from broader public good towards narrow specialities (Dimitriadis, 2006; Giroux, 1999). However, this research enquiry asserts that the context that academics undertake scholarly activity in the 'field' of sports coaching could be one in which the universities encourage *creative* effort and the formation of multidisciplinary groupings, which would result in inventive problem nets, research programmes and ideas (Barnett, 2000a); in other words an environment conducive for investigation in the reconceptualised 'field'.

Chapter 2 of the research enquiry offers what Lawrence Grossberg (2006) has termed a critical history of the present through consideration of the social forces that comprise our conjunctural moment. It explicates the rise and adoption of neoliberalism, from its genealogy as a strategic political response to the global recession in the late fifties, to its global hegemonic omnipresence of current times. Although seen as a 'commonsense of the times' (Peck and Tickell, 2002), by invoking and deploying Lauder et al. (2006), the *success* of the market economy is critiqued in order to highlight the issues with the corporate capitalist 'fairytale' of neoliberalism (Giroux, 2005). Once the oppositional mobilisation has been mapped, the impact of neoliberalism on the higher education sector is unpicked, using historical 'moments' to frame the discussion. Ending with 'New' Labour *Mark* II's third term in office, the current 'moment' of capitalist order dominant in the 'locality' of the higher education system is presented.

Chapter 3 illuminates the impact that neoliberalism has had on the core functions of universities and the academic community. It maps out how the theory of 'academic capitalism' (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004) – based on the analysis of the changing relations between higher education institutions and society – best describes how universities have actively positioned themselves *in* the new economy and are driving corporate dispositions. The resultant 'academic revolution' (Etzkowitz et al., 1998) in higher education has led to a commodification of teaching and research activities; in essence, a shift towards

corporate principles of efficiency, accountability, and profit maximisation, and away from social responsibility. Although knowledge has been instrumentalised and academics' work hyper-professionalised (Dimitriadis, 2006; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004), this context does afford possibilities of new networks for socially productive purposes and a diversification of higher education knowledges (David, 2007; Kincheloe and Steinberg, 2006; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004). Thus, the corporatisation of the higher education system can be seen to be an *opportunity* for scholars to mobilise a critical pedagogy to empower the powerless and to transform social inequalities and injustices within the context of neoliberal influences (Barnett, 2000a; McLaren, 2003).

Building on the previous chapters that illuminated the influence of neoliberal ideology on higher education policy in tandem with the impact that this has had on scholarly activity, chapter 4 situates the 'theme field' of sports coaching research within the wider context of the critical academy study of sport. As sport policy occupies a contested space with the same ideological influences as those located in higher education, this chapter maps the impact this has on sports policy, and then situates this within a global context. The importance that is placed on sport by nation states and global associations *must* be mapped out to fully appreciate the conjunctural history of the sports coaching present. Then, locating this within higher education, academia, and sport, the rise of sports coaching as an academic endeavour, the current sports coaching landscape, and the *influence* of sports coaching research is mapped. As a result, there is a need to overcome the invisible networks of prestige afforded to the 'elders' or 'gatekeepers' of sports coaching knowledge that prevail over a one-dimensional, evidence-based portrait of sports coaching, and evolve the field in order to gain a fuller understanding of its complexity and contribute to wider social issues. In doing so, the evolution of sports coaching knowledge becomes "attuned to dynamic relationships connecting individuals, their contexts, and their activities instead of focusing on these separate entities in isolation from one another" (Kincheloe, 2001, p.689).

Chapter 5 explicates the inconvenient truth that in order to challenge the epistemological hierarchy that privileges positivist, quantitative, predictive ways

of knowing (Andrews, 2008), the 'field' of sports coaching fundamentally needs to embrace a fresh *modus operandi*. After critiquing the evangelical status afforded to evidence-based research (EBR), the chapter develops a line of thinking that embraces a physical cultural studies (PCS) sensibility to frame the ontological, epistemological, and axiological praxis underpinning the reconceptualised 'field' of sports coaching research. In doing so, the commitment of PCS to progressive social change locates the reconceptualised 'field' as a 'performative pedagogy' (Giroux, 2001) with an underlying intent based on a 'moral ethic' (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a). The chapter also considers how best to focus and magnify events of inquiry, and discusses the expansive and flexible methodological toolbox available to practitioners in the reconceptualised 'field'. The concept of the researcher-as-methodological bricoleur (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005b) is deployed, and then the chapter explicates that the ontological, epistemological, and methodological advances *must* be accompanied by similar advances in expressing and (re)presenting (Amis and Silk, 2008). In the reconceptualised 'field', new territories of expression can be experimented with, however, it should be remembered that writing is still the main form of communication in the social sciences. It is therefore argued that the reconceptualised 'field' considers democratising writing practices and deploying what Richardson (2000b) terms 'creative analytic practice ethnography'.

The final chapter (Chapter 6) of the research enquiry is the conclusion. Although signifying the end of this research enquiry, it marks the beginning of a project concerned with the progressive potential of a 'field in tension' (Silk and Andrews, in press). In the conclusion, the impreciseness, limiting, and somewhat misleading terms 'sport' and 'coaching' are unpicked, and by not merely adopting a PCS sensibility, but embracing it, a new nomenclature for the 'field' of sports coaching research is presented. There is a call for practitioners working in the reconceptualised 'field' – the *bricoleurs* – to challenge the corporate dispositions that are driving academics' work, become 'border intellectuals' (Giroux, 1995), and use the monikers of multidisciplinarity, interdisciplinarity, and intellectual integration to guide their scholarly activity. In 'doing coaching justice', academics need to escape from their ascribed label and dispositions of

neo-liberal subjects, and instead of focusing on survival as being an *individual* responsibility, survival in the current 'moment' should be viewed in terms of *social* responsibility (Dimitriadis, 2006).

CHAPTER 2: Towards a Corporate Culture in Higher Education

> We are living in dangerous times in which a new type of society is emerging unlike anything we have seen in the past – a society in which symbolic capital and political power reinforce each other through a public pedagogy produced by a concentrated media, which has become a cheerleading section for dominant elites and corporate ruling interests. This is a society increasingly marked by a poverty of critical public discourse, thus making it more difficult for young people and adults to appropriate a critical language outside of the market that would allow them to translate private problems into public concerns or to relate public issues to private considerations. This is also a social order that seems incapable of questioning itself, just as it wages war against the poor, youth, women, people of colour, and the elderly (Giroux, 2004a, pp.206-207).

2.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to frame the climate/context in society – in other words the time and space that we inhabit – of the current moment. According to Silk and Andrews (in press) we are confronted with a specific stage in the evolution of the liberal capitalist order that, in its present form, using the discourses of neo-liberalism, neo-conservatism, neo-imperialism, and neo-scientism, frames the subjective and material experience of the current moment. This 'moment' – referred to as our 'proto-fascist present' (Giroux, 2005a) or the 'pernicious present' (Silk and Andrews, in press) – is symbolised by 'methodological fundamentalism' (House, 2006) and an increase in the commercialisation and managerialism associated with institutes of higher education (Silk and Andrews, in press). In order to locate the current moment, this chapter will be broadly divided into three sections. The first section will trace the emergence and ascendancy of neoliberalism as well as considering the contemporary positioning relating to the local debate within the construct of globalisation. Section two will deploy the work of Lauder et al. (2006) to challenge the assumption that prosperity, democracy and social justice can be delivered by a market economy. Section three will chart the development of the dominant discourse(s) surrounding the evolution of the liberal capitalist order prevalent in higher

education in the United Kingdom. It will illuminate the key players, policy initiatives, and ideological assumptions that have contributed to the development of the 'corporate culture' (Giroux, 1999) in higher education over the last quarter of a century.

2.2 The Rise of Neoliberalism

The dismantling of the Berlin Wall in 1989 was the dramatic moment that assigned communism to the archives of world history and offered vindication that a market economy was the only way to deliver prosperity, democracy and social justice (Brown and Lauder, 2001). It is events dating back ten years prior to this historical moment in time that future historians may well view as the crossroads in the world's social and economic history (Harvey, 2005). Harvey (2005, p.1) cites Deng Xiaoping's steps towards the liberalisation of the communist-ruled economy in China in 1978, Paul Volcker taking command at the U.S. Federal reserve in 1979, Margaret Thatcher being elected Prime Minister of Britain in 1979, and Ronald Reagan being elected as President of the U.S. in 1980 as the epicentres from which "revolutionary impulses seemingly spread and reverberated to remake the world around us in a totally different image". It was the late 1970s that saw the shift[3] as neoliberalism moved from the philosophical project and abstract intellectualism of Hayek and Friedman to the state-authored restructuring projects of Thatcher and Reagan, what Peck and Tickell (2000, p.388) characterise as a movement from "proto-" to "roll-back" neoliberalism.

However, Hall (1983, p.19)[4] explains that although Margaret Thatcher gave the swing to the right "a powerful impetus and a distinctive personal stamp", when properly analysed the deeper movement has a much longer trajectory. Although Hall (1983) writes that economic decline in Britain is not a new phenomenon,

[3] A second neoliberal transformation occurred in the early 1990s. The neoliberal project metamorphosed into more socially interventionist forms, epitomised by the Third-Way politics of the Clinton and Blair administrations. Peck and Tickell (2002, p.389) refer to this as "roll-out" neoliberalism.

[4] See Stuart Hall (1983) *'The great moving right show'*.

dating back at least a century, it is worth noting the post-war context which was the precursor to Thatcherism:

> The 1945 Labour Government, under the impact of war and the radicalisation of the working class, carried through a series of major structural changes including nationalisation, the welfare state and full employment. At the same time, it sought to restore Britain's international position in the context of the new post-war situation. This involved the maintenance of the Empire and its legacy together with a major international military and financial role for Britain. The key here was the relationship with the United States, which, given the weaknesses of other western powers and the onset of the cold war, was seeking a special relationship with Britain (Jacques, 1983, p.40).

The fifties[5] saw a period of rapid economic growth, rising living standards, full employment, and relative social stability, however by the late fifties this picture of social harmony was being undermined by the first cracks in the cold war, the rapid growth of Britain's competitors, a reduction in traditional imperial markets, and a growing concern about the economy. It is important to emphasise that the nature of the sustained recession was global and not isolated in Britain (Brenner and Theodore, 2002a). There was a need for a strategic political response to the "declining profitability of traditional mass-production industries and the crisis of Keynesian welfare policies" (Brenner and Theodore, 2002a, p.350).

Successive changes in government[6] prior to Margaret Thatcher being elected Prime Minister of Britain in 1979 served only to emphasise that "the new dawn of the fifties had only been a temporary interregnum" (Jacques, 1983, p.41). The 'modernist' approach of Wilson's labour government, the 'laissez-faire' conceptions of economic and industrial policy[7] of Heath's conservative government, and the 'working class quiescence' of the returning labour government in 1974 did nothing to halt the relative decline of Britain. In describing the 'decay' of British society, the adverse economic environment, and

[5] The political centre of gravity shifted towards the Tories well before their return to government in 1951 (Jacques, 1983).
[6] Labour governments (1964-1970); Conservative government (1970-1974); Labour governments (1974-1979).
[7] Emphasising the function of market forces and a reduced role of the state.

the transition to the Thatcher government, Bleaney (1983, pp.134-135) maps the emergence of a new direction in economic management:

> Public services were cut back to make room for tax cuts, but private incomes were controlled (or at least meant to be) by an endless succession of incomes policies. Labour, once become 'the natural party of government' in Harold Wilson's famous phrase, had almost inadvertently become the main bulwark of an unsatisfactory status quo. Meanwhile the Conservatives, under the leadership of Mrs Thatcher since 1975, had developed a coherent and strident political challenge…they argued the whole drift of British society since around 1960 (or even before) had been for the worse, and that economic revival required radical changes which would reverse that drift. In particular, drastic reductions in the economic role of the state and the burden of taxation were necessary to liberate private enterprise.

The belief that the optimal mechanism for economic development is through the liberation of state interference in the economy – resulting in open, competitive and unregulated markets – is the linchpin of neoliberal ideology (Brenner and Theodore, 2002a).

Although Britain through 'Thatcherism', and the United States through 'Reaganism', were exposed to particularly aggressive programs of neoliberal restructuring during the 1980s, the global influence (or imposition?) of a more moderate form of neoliberal ideology spread to traditionally social democratic or social christian democratic states such as Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands and Sweden in Europe, and Canada and New Zealand on the world stage (Brenner and Theodore, 2002a). "By the mid-1980s…neoliberalism had become the dominant political and ideological form of capitalist globalisation" (Brenner and Theodore, 2002a, p.350) and due to the global hegemony of this mode of political rationality it has become omnipresent, a commonsense of the times (Peck and Tickell, 2002). Neoliberalism is *everywhere* and has been referred to as a "new religion" (Peck and Tickell, 2002, p.381), a "new planetary vulgate" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2001, p.2) and an ideological "thought virus" (Beck, 2000, p.122).

Paradoxically some academics and policy makers in recent decades have turned their attention to the notion of 'the local' (Brenner and Theodore, 2002b).

Neoliberal precursors to this contemporary appeal to 'the local' are factors such as globalisation, the financialisation of capital, and the erosion of the nation state. With the absence of regulation from global, supranational or national levels, a greater emphasis is therefore placed on localities as an arena for capitalist regulation[8]. This emergence of the local is reinforced by Jessop (2002) who states that the national scale of policymaking and implementation is being seriously challenged as local and regional levels of government and social partners gain new powers. As a result, there is a desire to "find creative 'postnational' solutions to current economic, political, social, and environmental problems, rather than relying primarily on national institutions and networks" (Jessop, 2002, p.460). The idea of reframing local debate is attempted by Chen (1994, p.681) in articulating the notion of a new strategy of 'international localism' "that would confront the local and simultaneously international restructuration of power in the new nationalist, neo-colonialist, and postsocialist contexts". In framing this form of political ethics, Chen (1994, p.704) urges local struggles to be "conscientious and consider forming international connections". In conceding that what is proposed could be taken as a rehash of leftist positions, Chen (1994, p.707) concludes by stating that politically "it favours struggle against all forms of hegemonic domination across the board as a means of building alliances among the people and against the international power bloc".

Following on from Chen's (1994) concept of 'international localism', rethinking the global phenomenon as a new political order, or a new form of sovereignty, is considered in Hardt and Negri's (2000) *'Empire'*[9]. Importantly in the context of this thesis, many associate the processes of globalisation and the new world order to the global hegemon, the United States:

> Proponents praise the United States as the world leader and sole superpower, and detractors denounce it as an imperialist oppressor…the most damning charge critics can level, then, is that the United States is repeating the practices of old European imperialists, while proponents

[8] For a discussion on the ambiguities this new 'localism' contains, see Brenner and Theodore (2002b) *'Preface: from the "new localism" to the spaces of neoliberalism'*.
[9] Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's *Empire* is one of the most important books – of political science? cultural studies? critical theory? – to emerge in recent years (Brown and Szeman, 2002).

> celebrate the United States as a more efficient and more benevolent world leader (Hardt and Negri, 2000, p.xiii).

Hardt and Negri (2000) respond to these assumptions by presenting the alternative hypothesis that a new imperial form of sovereignty has emerged. Although occupying a privileged position, the United States (or any nation-state) does not form the centre of an imperialist project. "Imperialism is over" (Hardt and Negri, 2000, p.xiv). Within this context, in *'Empire'* reference is made to the *localisation of struggles* and akin to Chen's (1994), local Leftist strategy. Hardt and Negri (2000), although admiring and respecting its proponents, argue that the false dichotomy presented between the global and the local as problematic. With the homogenisation and undifferentiated identity of the global and the preservation of heterogeneity and difference of the local, Hardt and Negri (2000) juxtapose that pre-existing local differences do not need to be defended, but an appreciation of the social machines that create and perpetuate local identities and difference – the *production of locality* – is needed. The result of this is to map a framework that designates the distinction between the global and the local in terms of referring "to different networks of flows and obstacles in which the local moment or perspective gives priority to the reterritorialising barriers or boundaries and the global moment privileges the mobility of deterritorialising flows" (Hardt and Negri, 2000, p.45).

The previous discussion about the role of the local in this debate about globalisation, serves to highlight some key tensions that exist when framing the political and ideological form of capitalist globalisation, neoliberalism. It is important before proceeding to emphasise that although neoliberalism promulgates the unitary logic of the market, universal cures and one-best-way policy strategies, it is in fact a nebulous phenomenon that is variegated in character. Undoubtedly, the powerful family resemblances necessitate conceptualisations that "must be attentive to *both* the local peculiarities *and* the generic features of neoliberalism" (Peck and Tickell, 2002, p. 388).

2.3 The *Success* of the Market Economy

Brown and Lauder (2001) intimate that the euphoria which followed the dismantling of the Berlin Wall in 1989 led a number of commentators to announce the 'end of history'[10]. In essence, "Western capitalism had not only assigned communism to the archives of world history, but had also offered a final vindication that a market economy was the only way to deliver prosperity, democracy and social justice" (Brown and Lauder, 2001, p.99). It could be argued that since the dismantling of the Berlin Wall, the communist crackdown in Tiananmen Square, the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, the two Gulf wars and the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre, to name a few, that history was in fact continuing and that Fukuyama could have been wrong. Bates (2002a, p.139) suggests that this could be the case:

> Could it be that the End of History was simply the passing of a particular phase of history – the end of the Enlightenment project of the universal rationally ordered society? Could it be the Death of Ideology was simply the end of US liberal pragmatism and the European project of social democracy? Could it be that the coming Global Civilization is simply a western fantasy based upon an exaggerated assessment of the success of its missionary project among the natives?

However, Fukuyama (1992, p.xii) states that what he "suggested had come to an end was not the occurrence of events, even large and grave events, but History: that is, history understood as a single, coherent, evolutionary process, when taking into account the experience of all peoples in all times". Invoking and paraphrasing Tamboukou (1999), in the context of this research enquiry, theorising the present as an 'episode', a result of struggle and relations of force and domination, is important when undertaking a genealogical exploration. There is a need to ensure that the *disruptions* that call in to question the linear evolution of history are explored. Despite the 'euphoria' surrounding the end of *History*, Lauder et al. (2006) illuminate three fundamental problems – or *disruptions* – confronting individuals and societies that place a challenge to the assumption that a market economy delivers prosperity, democracy and social

[10] For the pivotal work on the 'end of history' argument, see Fukuyama (1989) *'The end of history'*.

justice, namely: the control of technological and economic forces that threaten global catastrophe, the paradox of prosperity, and the opportunity trap. The importance of highlighting these challenges to the dominant view of the *success* of the global market economy is that the rhetoric of national prosperity, justice, and social cohesion – now taken as a matter of common sense – has direct consequences on the roles and functions ascribed to [higher] education. Thus, by elucidating the challenge to the *success*, it affords the possibility to challenge 'the education gospel' (Grubb and Lazerson, 2006).

2.3.1 The Control of Technological and Economic Forces that Threaten Global Catastrophe

In considering 'the control of technological and economic forces that threaten global catastrophe', Lauder et al. (2006) cite powerful factors such as potential nuclear holocaust[11], sustainability of the planet and advances in genetics as indicators of our inability to control the forces we have unleashed. This loss of control is attributed to an imbalance between the historically counteracted forces driving the transformation of Homo sapiens from neolithic to nuclear humanity, and the counter forces associated with ensuring stability in human social environments (Hobsbawm, 2005)[12]. This imbalance, resulting from the globalisation of the free market, produces a "condition of polarization and maldistributions, of privilege and exclusion which is unstable and unsustainable economically, ecologically, socially and politically" (Bates, 2002a, p.141). Importantly, Hobsbawm (2005, p.4) intimates that the imbalance or disequilibrium has been tilted so far in one direction that it "is almost certainly beyond the ability of human social and political institutions to control". The attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 "struck America as a thunderclap, disclosing something that had been excised or repressed before: namely, the vulnerability of the country in the midst of a

[11] Not only nuclear holocaust but could be interpreted as a metaphor for any 'armed' struggle (war, ethnic cleansing, acts of terror etc.)
[12] See Klein (2007) for an insightful look at how people of power cash in on chaos – the 'shock doctors' – in order to remake our world in their image. Klein (2007) describes this as 'disaster capitalism'.

relentlessly globalizing world" (Dallmayr, 2002, p.138). "In the aftermath of the monstrous events of September 11, 2001, there is a growing sense that history as we know it has been irrefutably ruptured" (Giroux, 2003, p.ix), and the significance of this rupture is that those traditional public spheres in which people exchanged ideas, debated, and shaped the conditions that structured their everyday lives appear to have little significance or political consequence (Giroux, 2003). In effect, these conditions serve to highlight the fragility of one of the benchmarks of the success of Western capitalism, namely democracy, through the imposition of new laws "that make it easier to undermine those basic civil liberties that protect individuals against invasive and potentially repressive government actions" (Giroux, 2003, p.ix).

In describing the space that we inhabit, Denzin (2004, p.137 – emphasis added) states that "today, violence, it seems, is everywhere, *democracy* is under attack, America is engaged in a war without end, a permanent war on the world". Denzin (2004) posits that in manipulating its versions of geopolitical reality, the Bush administration has constructed a version of truth concerning America and the threat by terrorists to democracy and freedom:

> I will never apologize for the United States…I don't care what the facts are (George H.W. Bush, cited in Roy, 2003, p.77).

Using it's version of truth, the Bush administration engaged in armed aggression using the slogan "War is peace" (Roy, 2001, p.125) to justify the "collateral damage, the loss of lives and culture caused by the weapons of war (and peace). Such losses are regrettably necessary if the world is to be made *safer* and more *peaceful*" (Denzin, 2004, pp.137-138 – emphases added). Denzin (2004) intimates that the Bush administration launched its war against Iraq by ignoring international opinion and thousands of war protesters. The rhetoric of the Bush administration visibly changed as time progressed. Initially evidence was presented in the form of photographs, statistics and intelligence dossiers that suggested that Iraq was behind the tragedies of 9/11, a haven for terrorists, and that they were sitting on a stockpile of imminently deployable lethal weapons, to one of regime change to make the world more peaceful.

The posturing of the U.S. as "the sole global superpower", one that "no longer needed to "consult with its European allies" or to "pay much attention to the interests of other nations" (Helmut Schmidt[13], cited in Steinmetz, 2003, p.323) reinforces its position as, what world system theorists would define as, a modern hegemon. We are engaged in a process of 'deterritorialization' (Scholte, 2000) moving towards a 'borderless world' (Ohmae, 1990) with a process termed globalisation. Globalisation in this context is taken to mean the sum total of the wide range of political, economic, and social processes of 'transnationalization'[14] and 'internationalization'[15] taking place in the world today (Cerny et al., 2005). According to Steinmetz (2003, p.330):

> One of globalisation theory's questionable assumptions is that it is possible to reproduce a decentred, open global economy without the international hegemony of one state or set of states. Hardt and Negri (2000, p. 177) recognize that "the figure of the U.S. government as the world cop" or as an imperialist hegemon is a real alternative "within the history of the U.S. constitution." But they mistakenly describe contemporary global capitalism as lacking a hegemon.

Within the context of the United States holding the position of a modern hegemon in a globalised world, the debate about the tension surrounding democracy, freedom, and security needs to be part of a wider discourse over the rise of neoliberalism and the collapse of the welfare state, the role of nation states within a globalised world, the growing sense that politics is, at best corrupt, at worst irrelevant (Giroux, 2002), and the reduction of citizenship to the largely privatised rituals of consumerism (Giroux, 2003). Indeed, the discourse needs to encompass the impact that the 'war on terror' has had on higher education institutions and the academy. With higher education in the United States increasingly relying on Pentagon and corporate interests, the "academy has largely opened its doors to serving private and governmental interests and in doing so has compromised its role as a democratic public sphere" (Giroux, 2008,

[13] German Chancellor (1974-1982)
[14] The development of a wide range of formal and informal structures and processes among the so-called '*behind-the-border actors*' (Cerny et al., 2005).
[15] The development of formal and informal mechanisms of cooperation and integration *among* states (Cerny et al., 2005).

p.56). The hegemonic status of the United States in a globalised world and the notion that an ethos of militarization no longer occupies a marginal place in the political landscape, means that the development of the university as a "militarized knowledge factory" (Giroux, 2008, p.56) is a phenomenon that could well be seen to permeate into the current historical conjuncture of higher education institutions in other nation states. Emphasising this conjuncture, the publication of Giroux's (2008) work on the context that he describes as *the biopolitics of militarization*, coincides with an announcement in the United Kingdom by the shadow schools secretary[16] that servicemen and women returning from Iraq and Afghanistan would be offered free university tuition in line with a similar scheme in the United States for returning troops. The 'Troops to Teachers' scheme is designed to facilitate the move of soldiers into the classroom in a bid to 'honour their service', with free university education for first degrees supplemented with further bursaries of £9,000 for those who take post-graduate teacher training:

> …In 1945 the American government honoured the men and women who'd fought against fascism – the greatest generation – with a piece of legislation, the GI Bill, which granted returning heroes the right to free university education…The young men and women serving in Afghanistan and Iraq are heroes of our time, their sacrifices in the cause of freedom make them the greatest of our generation, and they deserve the thanks of all of us. That is why a Conservative government will honour their service by guaranteeing them the right to free university education (Gove, cited in BBC, 2008, p.1).

2.3.2 The Paradox of Prosperity

According to Lauder et al. (2006) the second problem challenging the assumption that a market economy delivers prosperity, democracy and social justice is 'the paradox of prosperity':

> This paradox refers to the growing inequalities both within and between nations at a time when the global economy is wealthier than it has ever

[16] Michael Gove

> been. During the twentieth century the gross domestic product (GDP) of Britain increased more than sevenfold but income inequalities within Britain are as wide today as they were in the late nineteenth century (Halsey and Webb, 2000). The gap has also widened between rich and poor nations. Landes (1999) suggests that the gap between Switzerland and Mozambique is roughly 400 to 1, whereas the gap between the richest and poorest 250 years ago was around 5 to 1 (Lauder et al., 2006, p. 4).

In addition to this, Bates (2002a, p.140) suggests that the consequences of the policies from a global market economy have resulted in a 20:80 world in which "the wealthiest 20 percent of nations control 80 percent of the wealth and the poorest 80 percent make do with 20 percent of the wealth". As previously mentioned, Lauder et al. (2006) indicate that the sustainability of the planet is one of the indicators of our inability to control the forces we have unleashed, and this disequilibrium in a global 20:80 world is further illuminated when consideration is given to the emerging ecological 'catastrophe':

> The global pattern of resource use has remained the same since the UN's [United Nations] spectacular conference on the environment and development was held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. The most affluent 20 per cent of countries use up to 85 per cent of the world's timber, 75 per cent of processed metals, and 70 per cent of energy (Martin and Schumann, 1997, p.29).

Indeed, Chossudovsky (1996) suggests that the policies driven by capitalism have led to the burden of two trillion dollars of external debt in the developing world, effectively globalising poverty and destabilising entire countries resulting in the outbreak of social discord, ethnic conflicts and civil war. At this time when the global economy is wealthier than it has ever been, the exponential rise in the gap between the richest and poorest nations can be accurately measured by monitoring the status of children in relation to time-sensitive benchmarks such as the Millennium Development Goals (UNICEF, 2007). The stark reality of 'the paradox of prosperity' is emphasised by the following quotation:

> If the entire population of Seoul (Republic of Korea) died within one year, shock waves would reverberate throughout the world. Yet, the more than 10 million deaths each year of children under age five barely evokes a tremor…Nearly 4 million infants do not survive their first

> month of life. Half a million women die in pregnancy each year…more than 1 billion people do not have access to potable water. 2.3 million children are infected with HIV, millions more are affected due to parental illness, and 15 million have been orphaned (UNICEF, 2007, p. 4).

2.3.3 The Opportunity Trap

The third problem that confronts individuals and societies is 'the opportunity trap' (Lauder et al., 2006), and can be found to be inter-linked with 'the paradox of prosperity'. This inexorable link between 'opportunity' and 'prosperity' is highlighted by Brown (2006, p.381) who states that "the opportunity to make a better life is enshrined in democratic societies. It is one of the few constants in a maelstrom of technological, economic, and social change". In democratic societies, education sits at centre stage of social and policy agendas, with the growing importance attached to grades and credentials indicating a tightening bond between education, jobs, and rewards (Brown, 2006). The logic behind the linking of education, jobs, and rewards is emphasised by the Department of Work and Pensions:

> Work is the best route out of poverty for most parents and their children. This is not only because children in families where parents are in work are much less likely to be poor in income terms, although this is of course the case. It is also because it is paid employment that offers the most sustainable route out of poverty for the longer term; because work is good for the physical and psychological health of parents and hence their children; and because children who grow up in workless households are themselves much more likely to be poor in adulthood (DWP, 2007, p.3).

The rise of mass higher education, the drive for lifelong learning, the emphasis on individualisation, and the policy focus on the knowledge driven economy are part of the official mantra believed to deliver opportunity, prosperity and justice. Brown (2006) challenges this account of education due to the *opportunity gap* widening between the rich and the poor in countries such as the United States, Britain, and Australia.

Not only is the 'opportunity trap' an issue in the western, industrialised nations but is also evident on a wider world level in the economically poorer countries of

the ‘third’ world. In the western, industrialised nations “there are too many contestants chasing credentials, jobs, and rewards that only a few can attain” (Brown, 2006, p.381) and in the poorer countries unemployment is substantially higher and much of the employment is low-paid and “does not meet the requirement of adequacy to ensure that people can access what is required to live life with dignity” (Reynolds, 2005, p.12). This is reinforced by Chakraborty and Lahiri (2007) who state that there is an observable 33-fold income difference between the richest and poorest countries in the world. In the context of the global economy being wealthier than it has ever been, prosperity, democracy, and social justice is a distant, unobtainable fantasy for a significant proportion of the population in economically poorer countries. In addition to this and essentially framing the ‘opportunity trap’, Reynolds (2005, p.12) is sceptical about the possibility of change:

> The world’s population is rising at the rate of a quarter of a million every day and is set to continue rising at this rate at least until 2040. If the numbers of unemployed are not to rise in that period the *net gain* in jobs would have to be 1,750,000 a week for every week of every year for the next thirty five years.

2.3.4 The Oppositional Mobilisation

In light of the documented challenges to the assumption that a market economy delivers, prosperity, democracy and social justice – what Giroux (2005b) would describe as the ‘corporate capitalist fairytale of neoliberalism – it is not surprising to find a wide range of anticapitalist movements that have emerged over that last decade:

> From the Zapatista rebellion in Chiapas, the subsequent series of Gatherings for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism, and the December 1995 mass strikes in France to the mass protests against the WTO, the IMF, the World Bank, and the World economic Forum in locations such as Davos, Genoa, London, Melbourne, Mumbai, Nice, Prague, Seattle, Sydney, Washington DC, and Zurich, among many others. As such struggles continue to proliferate in the new millennium, anticapitalist forces throughout the world have come to identify neoliberalism as a

> major target for oppositional mobilisation (Brenner and Theodore, 2002a, p. 352).

There seems to be an important disjuncture between the ideology of neoliberalism and its everyday political operations and societal effects (Moody, 1997). Brenner and Theodore (2002a) explain how the aspiration of neoliberalism to create a 'utopia' of free markets liberated from state interference, has in reality instigated a rise in coercive, disciplinary forms of state intervention in order to impose market rule on all aspects of social life. In addition to this, instead of neoliberal ideology facilitating a self-regulatory market with optimal allocation of investment and resources, the reality is that the "neoliberal shift in government policies has tended to subject the majority of the population to the power of market forces whilst preserving social protection for the strong" (Gill, 1995, p. 407). The unrelenting pace of globalisation and the entrenched political hegemony of a neoliberal ideology (Macleod, 2002) have unquestionably led to more pronounced social difference and an increased polarisation of society; this is the context in which higher education institutions are operating.

2.4 The Changing Role of the State in Education: The Development of a Corporate Culture in Higher Education

> Neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterised by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to *create* and *preserve* an institutional framework appropriate to such practices (Harvey, 2005, p.2 – emphases added).

The key words in the previous quotation in relation to the role of the state are *create* and *preserve*. The state has to assure the quality and integrity of money and also guarantee the structures (for example: military, police, defence, legal) necessary to secure private property rights and to guarantee, by force if need be, the proper functioning of markets. Importantly, if markets do not exist then they must be created by the state. Examples of where state intervention has been

applied to create markets are in land, water, health care, social security, energy production and distribution, social security, environmental pollution, and…education (Harvey, 2005).

Invoking Evans (2005, p.69 – emphasis added), "the British Labour government has *adopted* a policy agenda, which in most crucial aspects reflects the continuing transformation of the British state into a competition state". In using the term 'adopted', Evans (2005) is inferring that the Labour government reinforced the neoliberal marketising trends of the Thatcher (and later John Major) period. In fact, as well as reinforcing these trends, after the 1997 general election, the Labour government (New Labour 'Mark I') extended the neoliberal marketising trends with Gordon Brown (the former Chancellor of the Exchequer) announcing five main initiatives: greater independence for the Bank of England; the adoption of a code for fiscal stability; a new fiscal framework; the creation of a new finance watchdog; and a streamlining the Bank of England's operations in the currency market (Evans, 2005). The role of the state was highlighted in February 1998 by the then Prime Minister Tony Blair (cited in Evans, 2005, p.72) who addressed the US State Department outlining what he termed the 'five clear principles of the centre-left':

> Stable management and economic prudence because of the global economy; a change in the emphasis of government intervention so that it dealt with education, training and infrastructure and not things like industrial intervention or tax and spend; reform the welfare state ('otherwise the right will dismantle it') through Welfare to Work and managed welfarism; reinventing government, decentralisation, opening-up government ('so that what counts is what works'); and, internationalism in opposition to the right's isolationism.

To appreciate the need for the Prime Minister to illuminate the 'five clear principles of the centre-left', and to specifically contextualise the change in the emphasis of government intervention in education, it is necessary to outline to changing role of the state during the preceding conservative government in relation to education in the higher education (HE) sector.

2.4.1 'Conservative Modernisation' and the 'Right Approach' to Higher Education

In 1969 Cox and Dyson produced a Black Paper to deal with the problem of universities and falling standards, although the remit was expanded to primary and secondary schools. This corresponded with Edward Heath being returned as Conservative Prime Minister with Margaret Thatcher as Secretary of State for Education. The Black Paper provided right wing ammunition ('Black Paper ideology') to the Conservative party and in 1970 this ammunition was fuelled by the Council for Preservation of Educational Standards (CPES, later re-named the National Council for Educational Standards). Lawton (1992) sees this as the start of right wing influence on policy formulation and the answer to left-wing progressivism, with the concepts of choice and preservation of traditional standards being core themes:

> But others were wanting much more radical policies, namely to move the discussion away from the state system to the desirability of choice outside state schools, for example, by means of vouchers. These two ideas - traditional standards and parental choice - were not unconnected: There was the assumption (partly but not entirely correct) that traditional standards were most likely to be found in independent schools. (Lawton, 1992, p.36)

The appointment of a right-wing junior Education minister in 1973 (Norman St. John Stevas), the establishment of the 'Think Tank' (Centre for Policy Studies, CPS) founded by Sir Keith Joseph in 1974, and the appointment of Margaret Thatcher to Conservative Party leader in opposition in 1975 all fuelled the growing momentum towards right-wing, neoliberal educational policies. During the Conservative opposition period a paper titled 'The Right Approach' was published indicating the desire to implement vouchers in the form of an Assisted Places Scheme that subsidised places in independent schools, and the publication of school examination reports in the form of league tables.

1979 saw Margaret Thatcher elected as Prime Minister and shortly after, Sir Keith Joseph was appointed Secretary of State. The momentum of right-wing policy influence was now irresistible in the field of educational policy. The

policy direction was one that would bring all sectors of the education system more into line with the free market. Writing in 1976, Sir Keith Joseph wrote:

> The blind, unplanned, uncoordinated wisdom of the market … is overwhelmingly superior to the well researched, rational, systematic, well meaning, cooperative, science-based, forward looking, statistically respectable plans of the government … The market system is the greatest generator of national wealth known to mankind: coordinating and fulfilling the diverse needs of countless individuals in a way which no human mind or minds could ever comprehend, without coercion, without direction, without bureaucratic interference (cited in Lawton, 1992, p.6).

Lawton (1992) argues that neo-liberal Hayekian thinking is evident in Thatcherism, and that human selfishness is not a problem as it is eventually transformed into a public good. Apple (2001, pp.38-39) analyses the important factors that lay behind the neoliberal influence on conservative modernisation, these can be summarised as follows: guided by the vision of a weak state (what is private is necessarily good and what is public is necessarily bad); economic rationality (efficiency and an 'ethic' of cost-benefit analysis are the dominant norms); students' as human capital (students to be given requisite skills to compete efficiently and effectively); educational institutions waste economic resources that could be applied elsewhere (educational institutions are 'black holes' into which money is poured); 'producer capture' (educational institutions respond to the demands of teachers, administrators and other state bureaucrats, not the consumer); consumer choice (the ideal of the citizen is that of a purchaser/consumer); democracy an economic rather than a political concept (policies give a message best called 'arithmetical particularism' in which the individual as a consumer, is deraced, declassed and degendered).

In addition to neoliberal economic theories, the Thatcher educational policies also demonstrated neoconservative 'cultural rightism', and together these demonstrated the twin New Right ideological bases of Thatcherism (Lawton, 1992):

> The neo-liberals tend to talk about choice, competition and the market in education, the neo-conservatives are more likely to advocate traditional values, traditional subjects, and less educational theory in the training of

> teachers, but greater immersion into the traditional values of good schools. (Lawton, 1992, p.7)

The increasing influence of the New Right, with its seemingly contradictory twin ideological bases were woven cleverly into Conservative education policy, what Gamble (1988) refers to as 'the free economy and the strong state':

> Unlike the neo-liberal emphasis on the weak state, neo-conservatives are usually guided by a vision of a strong state. This is especially true surrounding issues of knowledge, values and the body. Whereas neoliberalism may be seen as being based in what Raymond Williams would call an 'emergent' ideological assemblage, neoconservatism is grounded in 'residual' forms. It is largely, though not totally based in a romantic appraisal of the past (Apple, 2001, p.47).

Lawton (1992) infers that Thatcher managed to reduce the scope of government but maintain its strength, thus enabling conservative policy to encompass New Right ideology. It had been ideologically presumed that in the early 1980s, that if the government 'got out of the way' then the spontaneous operation of market forces would be sufficient for economic regulation (Peck and Tickell, 2002). Relative failures in the labour market, financial markets, transport, food systems and pollution were the precursors to the need for government intervention beyond deregulation and marketisation, "hence the deliberate stretching of the neoliberal policy repertoire (and its associated rhetorics) to embrace a range of extramarket forms of governance and regulation" (Peck and Tickell, 2002, p.390). The neoconservative ideology manifested itself with the emergence of strong state control of higher education but also other educational policies demonstrated this ideology through the implementation of mandatory national curricula, national testing and a repetitive call for raising standards (Apple, 2001). Apple (2005) terms these evaluative and measurement pressures introduced as a result of neoconservative ideology, an 'auditing culture', which ensured the *strength* of government in education:

> The ultimate result of an audit culture of this kind is not the promised de-centralisation that plays such a significant role rhetorically in most neo-liberal self-understandings, but what seems to be a massive *re-centralisation* and what is best seen as a process of de-democratisation (Apple, 2005, p.15 – emphasis added).

This re-centralisation – or de-democratisation – created the climate for the exponential rise in education policies in the 1980's and the "introduction of market forces and competition, the licence given to people to pursue personal and familial profit, and a diminished emphasis on redistribution, equity and social justice" (Tomlinson, 2001, p.3). According to Fowler (1994) the United Kingdom was the leader in market-oriented education reforms in the 1980's. Fowler (1994) cites the Assisted Places Scheme (1981), quasi-private City Technology Colleges (1986), and the Education Reform Act (1988) as key examples of reforms designed to increase competition and choice.

Lawton (1992, p.56) documents some of the changes brought about by the Education Reform Act (1988), and can be summarised to demonstrate the 'New Right' influences that resulted in significant changes in the higher and further education sectors. The University Grants Committee (UGC) consisting mainly of university professors was replaced by the Universities Funding Council (UFC), which integrated a higher number of members from industry and commerce with academics; polytechnics and larger colleges financed by the new Polytechnics and Colleges Funding Council (PCFC) which had a similar mix of academic and business experience as the newly formed UFC were removed from Local Education Authority control and became part of the national system of higher education, and; emergence of the concept of 'managerialism' and an increased dependence on the state. Higher education institutions would receive contracted funding from UFC and PCFC based on formulae that took into account the number of students and also research.

It was the concept of 'managerialism' that drew a great deal of criticism, the idea of the Secretary of State controlling the funding distributed by the UFC would inevitably lead to the reward of institutional entrepreneurship by an administration that encouraged market forces. Maclure (1989, cited in Lawton, 1992, p.57) commented on the magnitude of the change in the management of British higher education:

> The foundations have shifted. The idea of universities as independent centres of learning and research, capable of standing out against government and society, and offering critical judgements of varying objectivity, informed by learning and protected by the autonomy of historic institutions, is discarded. Instead universities are to be made servants of the State and its priorities.

In November 1990, Margaret Thatcher resigned from her position as leader of the Conservative Party and was replaced by John Major. John Major was elected Prime Minister and launched 'The White Paper: Higher Education: A New Framework' (May 1991) and proposed the abolition of the binary line. The binary policy sought to safeguard the universities' privileged scholarly activities in the face of growing demands of increasing numbers in higher education:

> The polytechnics and other public service institutions should leave to the universities the essential function of pursuing and transmitting specialist knowledge through research and scholarship and that, drawing on this knowledge should concentrate on the no less difficult and important task of meeting this wider demand from potential learners from 18-30. (Sir Toby Weaver 1982, cited in Silver 1990, p.69)

The Polytechnics main function was teaching and any research undertaken would be to fulfil one of the following two functions: research for industry, and; research to improve teaching. The argument for the removal of the binary line is also a reflection of the New Right ideologies shaping higher education policies. The removal of the binary line was not designed to improve the self-esteem of non-university higher education institutions or to make improvements to the quality of higher education. According to Lawton (1992, pp.74-75), it was justified in terms of competition: "institutions were expected to expand by competing for funds and students, and it was therefore desirable that this competition should not be artificially constrained by the binary distinction". In 1992 the binary line was abolished and over forty institutions were designated universities (McNay, 1999) leading to the appointment of a review chaired by Ron Dearing to investigate the nature, purpose and funding of universities as well as the issues of teaching and research. The Dearing Report (*Higher Education in the Learning Society*) was published in 1997, now under a New Labour Government with Tony Blair as Prime Minister and David Blunkett as

Secretary of State for Education with the following recommendations: raising the participation rate to 45% of young people; more sub-degree courses provided in FE colleges; substantial increase in public spending on higher education, and; graduates in work to contribute 25% of their tuition costs. New Labour had embraced the Dearing Report, except his recommendations on fees and student support, whilst simultaneously completing the Conservative project of turning all student grants in to loans. According to Watson (2006, p.2) "New Labour was too greedy", and it was this precipitate decision that has become the 'Achilles heel' of subsequent New Labour policy for higher education.

In July 1998 the government passed the Teaching and Higher Education Act which clearly established who was going to pay for the expanded access. Expansion to the student loans and abolition of maintenance grants coupled with the introduction of up-front tuition fees signalled that students were to become increasingly responsible for investing in their own education. Funding of higher education has always been a crucial issue, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) state that there had been a 36 per cent reduction in student funding between 1989 and 1997 (DfES, 2003). Coupled with the reduction in student funding, the DfES (2003) estimate that the backlog accumulated in teaching and research facilities during the rapid expansion of higher education in the 1990s to be at around £8 billion pounds.

2.4.2 The 'Third Way' and the 'New Modernisers'

Tomlinson (2001) alludes to the continuities and similarities in post-16 and higher education policies (and in educational policies across the whole spectrum) marking the transition in 1997 between Conservative and New Labour governments. The ideology guiding both governments was, according to Giddins (1998), an investment in human capital wherever possible:

> Governments of varying political persuasions around the world rediscovered human capital theory, a theory which is suggested that improving people's skills and capabilities makes them act in more productive ways, and assumed that investment in education will improve

> the quality of the workforce, which will in turn improve economic growth and productivity (Tomlinson, 2001, p.4).

Bottery (2000) sees the New Labour educational policies as a clear example of a nation state treating its educational system as a tool for national and economic development driven by global influences:

> Learning is the key to prosperity - for each of us as individuals, as well as for the nation as a whole. Investment in human capital will be the foundation of success in the knowledge-based global economy of the twenty-first century. This is why the government has put learning at the heart of its ambition. (Blunkett 1998, cited in Bottery 2000, p. 19)

Interestingly in the take up of the term *human capital*, not only is there a new conception of economic processes behind this politics, but a new conception of moralising explanations "of individual and collective pathologies underpin[ning] political strategies to regulate crime, enhance individual competencies, and administer security through activating the responsibilities of communities for their own well-being" (Rose, 2000, p.1408). This represents a reframing of society and the emergence of community as an object of government, and a new politics that aims to reconstruct citizens as moral subjects of responsible communities. The need to frame values in which this politics is grounded is important, Rose (2000) argues that reference to civil society, civic activism, strong communities, rights, duties and responsibilities are recurrent themes in Blair's vision of the Third Way[17].

New Labour policies reflect a divergence from the New Right viewpoint, referred to by some as the "Blairite 'Third Way' rhetoric" (Menz, 2005, p.50) implemented by the New Modernisers. The debate over a credible Third Way in British politics between the traditional positions of the Old Right (anti-state and pro-market), and the Old Left (pro-public ownership and state intervention and anti-market), "emerged within the context of trying to establish a more coherent future for social democratic politics" (Evans, 2005, p.73). Bottery (2000, p.33) suggests that New Right policies neglected social responsibility and resulted in

[17] For a detailed look at Third Way politics see Tony Blair's *'The Third Way: new politics for a new century'*.

an ironic expansion of the public sector, New Modernisers perceived that the market could be part of the problem rather than part of the solution:

> If the first part of the Third Way agenda meant accepting the reality of the market, the second part of this agenda meant devising policies that would bring the losers along. Thus, the phrase the 'inclusive society' came to be a popular term, even though it would not mean a return to the old redistributivist politics … What was required was a 'Social Investment State' to replace the old welfare state, one which subscribed to investment in human capital wherever possible, rather than the direct provision of economic maintenance.

It is interesting to note that one of the immediate effects of the Teaching and Higher Education Act (1998) was to cause a reduction in applications, identified by the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS), from under-represented groups applying to university: mature students; ethnic minorities, and; working class (Tomlinson, 2001). Targett (1998, p.12) reiterates the findings of UCAS, by stating in the Financial Times:

> Across the UK, applications for degree courses have fallen by 2.1% and applications for HND courses by 15.2%. With universities also suffering a drop in overseas applicants, fee reforms could halt the expansion of higher education and threaten the financial stability of some institutions.

As New Modernisers place more of an emphasis on an 'inclusive society' and the creation of a 'Social Investment State' in their policies in comparison to policies formulated on a New Right rationale, one would have expected to see the pivotal White Paper[18] (*The Future of Higher Education*, 2003) address this issue. The White Paper 2003 stipulates that massification of higher education will continue, and participation is to be increased towards 50 per cent of those aged 18 - 30 (DfES, 2003) through the development of two-year work focused degrees, foundation degrees developed with employers, and increased flexibility of courses. These three structural changes will encourage certain groups disadvantaged by the 1998 Act into higher education (some ethnic minorities and mature students), and in combination with the following economic concessions (DfES, 2003), the New Modernisers would perceive that they are creating the

[18] The White Paper (2003) was a precursor to the Higher Education Act 2004.

environment of a 'Social Investment State' allowing disadvantaged individuals to invest in themselves and contribute to the country as a whole: restoring grants from students from lower income families; universities to be required to draw up an Access Agreement; Access Agreements overseen by an independent Access Regulator (Office for Fair Access, OFFA); expansion of national AimHigher programme to develop links between universities and schools; universities reimbursed for additional costs of attracting students from non-traditional backgrounds; new package of grant support for part-time students, and; abolish up-front payment of tuition fees (i.e. allow students to defer payment until after graduation and linked to their ability to pay).

This commitment to the social aspect to higher education is reiterated in the 'values' that the DfES (2003, p.10) state that higher education subscribes to: contribution to the economic and social well being of the nation is of vital importance; wide access to higher education makes for a more enlightened and socially just society, and; equipping the workforce with appropriate and relevant skills.

There is no mention of standards or quality in the 'value' section of the White Paper 2003, the competing values of choice, efficiency and equity that Silver (1990) alluded to seem to have taken on a far greater prominence than quality. This New Modernisers drive to a 'Social Investment State' through the proposed strategies highlighted above has angered the 'new universities' because according to MacLeod (2003) they perceive that their track record in widening access to working class and ethnic minority students has been ignored. MacLeod (2003) infers that the government has missed the point in considering the 'fear of rejection' as a deterrent factor in attending a top university and that it is the 'fear of debt'. Diana Green (vice chancellor of Sheffield Hallam University, cited in MacLeod, 2003, p.1) says:

> The proposals imply that the reason these people do not apply to the 'top' universities is because they believe they won't be admitted. In fact a major disincentive to participation generally is worry about finance and the fear of debt - which doesn't figure in the government analysis at all … where there has been success in attracting students from these

> backgrounds, they have tended to study at local universities on cheaper courses … On the face of it, these proposals are focused on the top universities, but by applying them across the board it creates difficulties for universities like mine, where widening participation is not an issue.

The primary incentive of the Access Agreements is to ensure that the prestigious Russell group institutions and Oxbridge appease the widening access rhetoric, and with its implementation, this is placing extra stresses on universities already fulfilling OFFA standards. MacLeod (2003) also cites vice-chancellors from other institutions (Coventry University and Westminster University) who argue that their widening access programmes are the envy of other academic institutions but have concerns that generating bursaries to subsidise course fees could prove difficult (if not impossible) and that the increase in paperwork and administration required by OFFA will detract from investment into teaching and research.

It should be remembered that the social is subordinate to the economic (Bottery, 2000) and again demonstrates the influence of the New Modernisers in shaping the White Paper 2003. The DfES (2003, p.10) summarise the contribution that universities make to the national economy:

> In 1999 - 2000 they [universities] generated directly and indirectly over £34.8 billion of output and over 562,000 full time equivalent jobs throughout the economy. This is equivalent to 2.7 per cent of the UK workforce in employment. For every 100 jobs within the HEIs themselves, a further 89 were generated through knock on effects throughout the economy; and for every £1 million of economic output from higher education, a further £1.5 million is generated in other sectors of the economy.

Funding is not just an issue for students; it is also an issue for universities in a market economy. As previously mentioned, the universities have an investment backlog in teaching and research facilities of £8 billion due to decades of under-investment. The Government purports to wish to continue to be the major financial sponsor of universities:

> Government funding will increase to around £10 billion a year by 2005 - 06 to support university students, teaching and research - a rise of over

> 6% a year in real terms. This is equivalent to around £400 a year paid by every income tax payer in England, whether or not they personally gained from a university education. We believe that state support at this level is justified by the contribution of universities to the economy and society. (DfES, 2003, p.77)

The figures presented by the DfES (2003) indicate a good rate of return for the government: £10 billion investment into higher education in return for the generation of over £34 billion of output directly and indirectly. It is interesting to note at this point that many of the governments' economic competitors (France, Germany, the Netherlands, the USA, and shortly Japan) all invest more in higher education than the United Kingdom (1% of GDP in comparison to 0.8% of GDP respectively), in fact Watson (2006) indicates that the public funding of higher education as a proportion of GDP remains in the bottom third of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) league. This could be an indication that at the moment the United Kingdom is lagging behind their competitors, on a global scale. In reinforcing the rhetoric of global competition driving the higher education policies, the DfES (2003, p.13) state:

> Our competitors see - as we should - that the developing knowledge economy means the need for more, better trained people in the workforce. And higher education is becoming a global business. Our competitors are looking to sell higher education overseas, into the markets we have traditionally seen as ours.

The neoconservative vision of a strong state is evident in the funding structure of higher education outlined in the White Paper 2003, although a shift towards state supervision (Scott 1996, cited in Bauer et al., 1999) and an entrepreneurial element to universities income is also included in the White Paper 2003. This could be conceived to be a section of the policy that reflects New Right ideas, namely creating conditions for universities to act like businesses, institutional leadership developed and encouraged, and high levels of accountability. The following excerpt from the White Paper 2003 is one of the most significant with its implications for students. It provides the rationale for universities to attempt to regain its freedom or autonomy to an extent, and also allows them to seek alternative funding streams.

> The Government is making an unprecedented investment in universities and will stand by them in future spending reviews. But to be really successful, universities must be free to take responsibility for their own strategic and financial future. Strong leadership and management, freed from excessive red tape, will help them not just to respond to change, but to drive it. And more financial freedom will allow them to fund their plans, and unleash their power to drive world-class research, innovative knowledge transfer, excellent teaching, high-quality, greater and more flexible provision, and fair access. (DfES 2003, p.76)

The policy detail that is forwarded to bring about this can be summarised as follows (DfES, 2003, pp.76-77): creation of a Leadership Foundation to improve leadership and management in the sector; David Vandelinde task force to report on measures to reduce unnecessary red tape; support in building university endowments; set up of a task force to promote corporate giving - to be matched by creating a matched fund for endowment; ask new students to pay for the benefits they get from higher education; universities to have the freedom to set their own tuition fee (between £0 and £3,000) from 2006; no student or parent to pay any up front fees as contributions to be paid back through the tax system once they are earning (Graduate Contribution Scheme), and; threshold of loan repayment to be raised from £10,000 to £15,000 a year (from 2005).

2.4.3 'New' Labour *Mark II*'s Third Term

The success of this policy will depend on the students' perception on whether or not investing in higher education will secure them a guaranteed rate of return…namely the acquisition of credentials to give them a positional advantage. Underpinning this policy is the government assumption that "graduates on average earn much more than those without degrees and are far more likely to be in employment" (DfES 2003, p.9). This policy is symbolic of the reforms of a competition state, raising a challenge to the dependency culture of the post-war settlement and attempting to change individual and group attitudes to entrepreneurship (Evans, 2005). Commenting on the adoption of

competition state reforms by New Labour 'Mark II', Watson (2006, p.5) states that:

> The government wanted a 'market' and it now has one, but not where planned. Fees are not only almost uniform, but have the significant merit of being deferred (with income-contingent payment after graduation). The serious competition will be over bursaries and other incentives, without much positive impact on widening participation. The most socially progressive institutions will feel obliged to re-cycle the greatest proportion of their additional fee income to needy students, while most of the relevant action will be about well-qualified students from clued-up families operating their own 'post-qualifications auctions'. This is the other form of PQA [post-qualifications admissions system]: "what can you offer me?"

Watson (2006) depicts the initial stages of New Labour's third term of office as attempting to address three areas of unfinished business from the previous two terms in office: paying for HE; expansion and fairness; and purpose (what's it all for?). Reaffirming the dependence of New Labour 'Mark III' on neoliberal ideology to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to facilitating entrepreneurial freedoms, Ruth Kelly (in the first 'letter of direction' (January 31 2006) from the Secretary of State to the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE)) stated:

> We expect the Council [the Higher Education Funding Council for England] to continue to use the various funding streams at its disposal to support excellence across the full range of activities which institutions undertake, whilst encouraging each institution to define and implement its distinctive mission (cited in Watson, 2006, p.7).

As the Dearing Report 'celebrates' its tenth anniversary, Gordon Brown has replaced Tony Blair as Prime Minister in New Labour's third term of office. The chief minister of the Department for Education and Skills in the UK government was the Secretary of State for Education and Skills, this position was discontinued on June 28 2007 with the creation of the new posts of Secretary of State for Children, Schools and Families (Ed Balls) and Secretary of State for Innovation, Universities and Skills (John Denham). The Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS) brings together functions from the former Department of Trade and Industry (DTI), including responsibilities for

science and innovation, with further and higher education and skills, previously part of the Department for Education and Skills (DfES). In addition to this, the Department (DIUS) will work closely with the new Departments for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) and Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR) as well as other key Departments – including Communities and Local Government (CLG) and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) to ensure the wider personal, community and cultural benefits of education are supported (DIUS, 2007a). The formalising of the inexorable link between higher education and innovation again demonstrates New Labour's drive for entrepreneurship from universities. The additional emphasis on supporting the wider benefits of education to society through broadening the stakeholder influences from a range of government departments revisits the Third Way agenda, accepting the reality of the market and devising policies that would bring the *losers* along (Bottery, 2000).

In relation to the HE sector, the DIUS (2007b) will work to: sustain and develop a world-class research base; maximise the exploitation of the research base to support innovation across all sectors of the economy, and; raise and widen participation in HE. The focus of widening participation, despite it being described by Watson (2006, p.12) as "the most troublesome item in talk about higher education; in the media, in politics and beyond", is a significant change from the diminished emphasis on redistribution, equity and social justice noted by Tomlinson (2001) in relation to the introduction of market forces in the 1980s. Three successive terms of office by New Labour has still resulted in the expansion and fairness of HE being termed as 'unfinished business' (Watson, 2006). In order to "ensure that all people with the potential and qualifications, no matter what their background, have the opportunity to participate and succeed in HE" (DIUS, 2007c), the Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Innovation, Universities and Skills announced on July 5 2007 major changes to the system of student support in HE. These changes include increasing the number of students entitled to non repayable maintenance grants by increasing the threshold for the entitlement of the maximum grant from £17,500 in 2006/07 to £25,000 for 2008/09, and also students from families with incomes of up to £60,000 will be entitled to a partial grant. The DIUS (2007c) intimate that a third of students

from 2008/09 will receive a full grant (worth £2,825 a year) and a further third will receive a partial grant, meaning that two thirds of students will receive some grant each year in comparison to just over a half now. Firm guarantees of the amount of financial support for participation in HE will be given to all those 16 year olds who qualify for an Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA), more choice will be given to graduates over how to repay their student loans, and there will be an expansion of the Student Associate Scheme where high achieving undergraduates act as mentors for young people who might not otherwise go on to HE. In total, the government purport that 250,000 students from low, modest and middle incomes will gain from the new proposals once fully implemented (DIUS, 2007c).

To date, the new rhetoric from the DIUS seems poised to continue to address questions about how to support students, representing a shift in emphasis from the debates surrounding institutional funding that were prominent in the White Paper (2003) and the subsequent Higher Education Bill (2004). Issues related to the tension between expansion and participation such as the 'dumbing-down' of HE (including entry standards, "Micky Mouse" courses, vocationalisation, grade inflation and so on)[19] (Watson, 2006), and also 'fairer' admissions processes, employer support of HE, and the role of HE and the public interest are all topics that are requiring careful consideration in this new political era.

2.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, in attempting to illuminate the current moment in society, this chapter has mapped the key tensions associated with the assumption that a market economy delivers prosperity, democracy and social justice. Lauder et al's. (2006) three fundamental problems confronting individuals and societies were deployed – the control of technological and economic forces that threaten global catastrophe, the paradox of prosperity, and the opportunity trap – and

[19] See Personneltoday (2008) for an interesting press release pertaining to Butlins joining with Chichester University to offer degrees. This training scheme is not unique, and joins foundation degrees launched by supermarket giant Tesco and beds retailer Dreams.

illuminates that the 'euphoria' surrounding the end of *History* was indeed premature. Dramatic events, such as the terror attacks in New York, London, and Madrid and the repressive government actions serves to demonstrate the fragility of one of the benchmarks of Western capitalism – democracy. The existence of the 'paradox of prosperity' at both a national and also the wider world level is more evidence challenging the success of the market economy, whether it is child poverty rates, income inequalities, or the gap between the richest and poorest nations. The issue of the existence of the 'opportunity trap' and the scramble of individuals (referred to as contestants by Brown, 2006) chasing credentials, jobs, and rewards that only a few can attain further challenges the *success* of the market economy.

Our understanding of the current moment within higher education – whether it is paraphrased as our 'proto-fascist present' (Giroux, 2005a) or as the 'pernicious present' (Silk and Andrews, in press) – can be seen to have evolved from the dominant global discourse surrounding a theory of political economic practices termed neoliberalism. It was demonstrated that neoliberalism can be viewed as a nebulous phenomena, variegated in character, evolving over time that can be manipulated or reframed at a local level. The end result is a liberal capitalist order dominant in the 'locality' of the higher education system, with a concomitant increase in commercialisation, vocationalisation, privatisation, marketisation and managerialism. The importance of an increased awareness in the rise in 'corporate power' (Giroux, 1999) in higher education and the adoption of the market economy with the trappings of capitalism (maximising profits and minimising costs) place an emphasis on a strong civic society to act as a countervailing power to hold the corporate power in check:

> This is not to suggest that capitalism is the enemy of democracy, but in the absence of a strong civil society and the imperatives of a strong democratic public sphere, the power of corporate culture when left on its own appears to respect few boundaries based on self-restraint and those non-commodified, broader human values that are central to a democratic civic culture. John Dewey was right in arguing that democracy requires work, but that work is not synonymous with democracy (Giroux, 1999, p.14).

The following chapter will illuminate the impact that neoliberalism has had on the core functions of universities and the academic community. It will also consider whether the role education has to play is in producing a strong civil society and be treated as a public good, what Giroux (1999) would describe as developing a 'vibrant democratic culture', as opposed to a site for commercial enterprise.

CHAPTER 3: What is the role of academia?

> According to many social theorists, the latter years of the second Millennium saw changes which have resulted in a tendency towards more individualised risk-taking. Labour markets have changed rapidly, making the 'job for life' a thing of the past; global communications have problematized pre-existing notions of time, place and community; goods and services have become increasingly commodified, and consumption has increasingly replaced production as a prime concern. Taken all in all, increasingly abstract and globalized systems and institutions have left individuals isolated from relatively fixed local communities and structures, and have imposed upon them increasing demands to make continual lifestyle choices (Stables, 2003, p. 11).

3.1 Introduction

It is not the purpose of this chapter to be drawn in to the debate surrounding two and a half millennia of philosophical contributions to the justification, purpose, place and function of [higher] education, and the concomitant role of the academic, in society. Whether it is the classical Greek philosophers (Socrates; Plato; Aristotle)[20], the Enlightenment *philosophes* (for example: Kant; Rousseau; Locke; Voltaire; Froebel; Hume; Herbart; Pestalozzi), contemporary twentieth-century thinkers (for example: Dewey; Levi-Strauss; Baudrillard; Bernstein; Bourdieu[21]; Rorty; Weber), or the 'continental philosophical movements' of existentialism, phenomenology, critical theory, hermeneutics and postmodernism (Noddings, 2007), they would all have a singularly unique lens through which to contribute to the discussion. The purpose of this chapter is to map out how neoliberal ideology has impacted contemporary higher education.

[20] See Carr (2003, p.75) for an interesting analogy with the modern day from the dialogue contained in *The Gorgias*, as located here is the most conspicuous conflict between Socrates and the so-called 'Sophists', "who were the market- or consumer-oriented educationalists of the day". There has always been a strong case for making the Platonic dialogue *The Gorgias* required reading for all prospective educationalists and teachers (Carr, 2003). See Plato's *Gorgias* in Hamilton and Cairns (1961) and also in Johnson (1998).

[21] See Bourdieu (1997) for an insightful discussion on the seditious role that the education system can play in reproducing social inequality.

David (2007) argues that the twenty-first century has seen global social and economic change that has reconceptualised our understandings of higher education in relation to the economy, society, labour markets and knowledge (see Barnett, 2000a; Burgan, 2006; Delanty, 1998; Delanty, 2001; Frank and Gabler, 2006; Lauder et al., 2006; Sagaria, 2007; Shavit et al., 2007; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004). As a result of neoliberalism, the new 'governmentality' (Olssen and Peters, 2005) and 'audit culture' (Frith, 2001) that regulates higher education has impacted on the core functions of universities and the academic community. This chapter unpicks these challenges presented to universities by the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime and illuminates the potential opportunities that might be afforded by it.

3.2 Towards Academic Capitalism in the New Economy

Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) developed the theory of "academic capitalism" to explain the process of university integration into the new economy. It should be emphasised that university integration into the new economy is not merely a response to the wider world (Barnett, 2000a), or the result of academia being "duped" (Dimitriadis, 2006). Universities have actively positioned themselves *in* the new economy and are driving the corporate dispositions that have resulted in the evolution of the 'entrepreneurial university' (Clark, 1998). The theory of academic capitalism is based on the analysis of the changing relations between higher education institutions and society in the "new" global knowledge[22] society:

> The theory of academic capitalism moves beyond thinking of the student as consumer to considering the institution as marketer. When students choose colleges, institutions advertise education as a service and a life style. Colleges and universities compete vigorously to market their institutions to high-ability students able to consume high debt loads. Student consumers choose universities that they calculate are likely to bring a return on educational investment and increasingly choose majors linked to the *new economy*, such as business, communications, media arts…When students graduate, colleges and universities present them to

[22] Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) use the terms *knowledge society*, *information society*, and *new economy* interchangeably.

> employers as output/product, a contribution to the *new economy*, and simultaneously define students as alumni and potential donors (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004, pp. 2-3 – emphases added).

In addition to the *new economy* (what Said (1983) referred to as the 'free' market forces), Dimitriadis (2006) also alludes to the inextricably linked influence of the multinational corporations that Said (1983, p.4) stated disdainfully that the citizens of a modern society had been "left in the hands of":

> Universities are actively marketing sponsored products (e.g. negotiating exclusive licensing rights for Pepsi, McDonalds, or Apple computers etc.) to their captive students while aggressively capitalising on the intellectual work of their faculties (e.g. securing patents and copyrights[23] from ongoing faculty research, etc.) (Dimitriadis, 2006, p. 369).

Slaughter and Rhoades (2004, p.4) emphasise how higher education institutions in the United States have embraced this new economy; "In the new economy, knowledge is a critical raw material to be mined and extracted from any unprotected site; patented, copyrighted, trademarked, or held as a trade secret; then sold in the marketplace for a profit."

Certain 'for-profit' higher education systems (such as the University of Phoenix) would use all the mechanisms outlined in order to protect its intellectual property. Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) cite the example of the Billionaire John Sperling who made his money through the University of Phoenix to demonstrate the trade in services characteristic of the new economy:

> University of Phoenix, Inc., became a subsidiary of a larger enterprise run by Sperling, the Apollo Group, which included the Institute for Professional Development, The College for Financial Planning Institutes Corporation, and Western International University, Inc. (Apollo Group, 2002 cited in Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004, p. 3).

Sperling and Tucker (1997) emphasise that public and nonprofit private universities receive around 60% of their operating expenses from public subsidy, a subsidy that 'for-profit' institutions do not receive and yet still are successful at

[23] For an insightful discussion on copyright issues in universities (public and private domains) see McSherry (2006).

securing market share and also making a profit. In addition to this, Sperling and Tucker (1997, p. 52) are critical of public and nonprofit universities, stating that they have "capital-intensive input standards and operationally inefficient structures". Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) do however point out that 'for-profit' institutions are indirect recipients of substantial federal subsidy through the students participating in government sponsored financial aid programmes that have evolved as a result of the government shifting resources from public welfare functions to production functions.

Presenting the higher education system in the United States as a duality is too simplistic in the current moment of the new economy. Further blurring of the distinction between 'for-profit' and 'nonprofit' (public) institutions also comes as a result of the nonprofit institutions of higher education using many of the same mechanisms as those demonstrated by their profit oriented competitors:

> …extended managerial capacity, part-time faculty, copyright, and information technology – to create profit centres. These profit centres do not accrue revenue for stockholders, but they do generate (non-taxed) external monies that are used to cross-subsidise other institutional activities, which often involve investment in infrastructure to integrate colleges and universities with the new economy. Like [the University of] Phoenix, public and nonprofit private higher education institutions rely heavily on public funding, expending taxpayer dollars in pursuit of external revenues from corporations (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004, p. 4).

Although Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) were writing out of the United States context, the same increasing engagement in market and marketlike activities are now evidenced in university life worldwide, with post-Thatcher England and contemporary Australia being two of the most notable examples (Dimitriadis, 2006; Kennedy-Wallace, 2000). In British universities the underlying problem is underinvestment, with successive governments demanding that universities teach more and more people without appropriate resourcing. In essence, this has resulted in a reduction in funding of 50 per cent (Frith, 2001)[24]. Indeed, Frith (2001) cites that in his department, which offers film and media studies, the

[24] For a detailed look at how the expansion of higher education has influenced the funding base, see Greenaway and Haynes (2001) *'Funding higher education in the UK: the role of fees and loans'*.

Scottish Higher Education Funding Council (SHFCE) formula means that they make a financial loss on each student taken. This inevitably puts pressure on universities to undertake short-term policy-making decisions[25], resulting in crisis management, an audit culture, and the need to secure funds by different means.

The theory of academic capitalism therefore positions educational institutions as places that are "less concerned with developing citizens who can thoughtfully deliberate the "common good" in the public sphere than with producing workers ready to take their attendant positions in the economic system" (Dimitriadis, 2006, p. 370).

3.3 Impact of the New Economy on Academics

Edward Said developed the idea of 'Orientalism', "through which he [Said] sought to describe the relationship between colonial knowledge and the exercise of imperial power" (Rizvi and Lingard, 2006, p.293). With the idea of Orientalism, Said transformed the humanities, "in that it pointed to a new way of understanding colonialism and the historical construction of the Orient as an object of western gaze, variously represented as alien, barbaric, uncivilized, sensual, or exotic" (Rizvi and Lingard, 2006, p.295). The importance of Said's contribution to post-colonialism as a theoretical perspective needs to be acknowledged (Rizvi and Lingard, 2006), but viewed in the knowledge that this theoretical perspective is distinctive from, and in fact oppositional to, that of post-modernism:

> Whereas post-modernism in one of its programmatic statements (by Jean-Francois Lyotard) stresses the disappearance of the grand narratives of emancipation and enlightenment, the emphasis behind much of the work done by postcolonial artists and scholars is exactly the opposite: the grand narratives remain, even though their implementation and realization are at present in abeyance, deferred or circumvented (Said, 2003[26], p.351).

[25] How to prop up failing departments, how to respond to immediate student demands, how to ensure a good RAE score (Frith, 2001).
[26] Original work published 1978.

Rizvi and Lingard (2006) argue that this is indicative of Said's work in its avoidance of following intellectual fashions, its provisionality, and its eclecticism[27] working across difference. It is these very characteristics that provide us with an illuminating discussion on the role of the intellectual.

The eclectic way in which Said (1994) makes use of Foucault[28], Gramsci, critical theorists and more recent feminist theory to present a new logic for the Palestinian question in which "difference" did not entail "domination" (Said, 1994, p.100), is based on the premise that intellectuals and others exercise critical sense, memory and scepticism. For Said:

> …the idea of critical sense consisted of the ability to go beyond the special interests of the experts and be prepared to be self-reflexive of their relations to power. He [Said] thus drew a fundamental distinction between power elites and the critical sense that intellectuals are able to bring to political deliberations (Rizvi and Lingard, 2006, p.300).

This critical sense that *humanistic* intellectuals bring to political deliberations requires the intellectual to be able to 'speak truth to power', nevertheless some might think it problematic that to speak truth to power involves not only speaking to, but also imploring and reacting to power. Situating the role of the intellectual vis-à-vis with power affirms that the intellectual must raise a challenge to market forces. This is highlighted by Said (1983, p.4) who, in articulating his disparagement for the contemporary practices of literary criticism, claims that the citizens of modern society "have been left to the hands of 'free' market forces and multinational corporations". It is the impact of the 'free' market forces and multinational corporations and its influence on the role of the academic/education that will be mapped out in the following discussion.

---

[27] There are critics to Said's work. Said joins together Foucault's ideas on knowledge and power and Gramsci's notion of hegemony, alongside notions such as "human experience" and "human reality", which are located in a philosophical tradition of which both Foucault and Gramsci are critical (Rizvi and Lingard, 2006). See Kennedy (2000).

[28] Said (2003) argues for the use of Foucault's notion of discourse: "I have found it useful here to employ Michel Foucault's notion of a discourse, as described by him in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and in *Discipline and Punish*, to identify Orientalism" (Said, 2003, p.3). In addition to this, the Foucauldian idea of "knowledge as power" is situated throughout Said's work. For a more detailed account of Foucault's thoughts see McNay (1994).

Unfortunately, Said did not write anything specifically about education[29], however Said's work on the nature of the intellectual is "important and particularly critical for navigating this moment of political, cultural, and economic retrenchment" (Dimitriadis, 2006, p. 369). Therefore Said's work can positively contribute in the attempt to frame how this changing role of the academic/education can be rethought, "especially in a globalised world increasingly dominated by the rampant individualism of the market" (Rizvi and Lingard, 2006, p.304).

The impact of the new economy on academia in terms of research function and research universities is also an area for discussion. Etzkowitz et al. (1998, p.1) talk of an "[academic] revolution" that involves "the translation of research into products and into new enterprises". The revolution is dependant upon academia developing distinct collaborations and networks. Slaughter and Rhoades (2004, p. 15) present these collaborations and networks as:

> …new circuits of knowledge, interstitial organisational emergence, networks that intermediate between public and private sector, extended managerial capacity – that link institutions as well as faculty, administrators, academic professionals and students to the new economy. New investment, marketing and consumption behaviours on the part of the university community also link them to the new economy. Together, these mechanisms and behaviours constitute an academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime.

This academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime[30] has had a number of consequences on academia. Academics now undertake research in collaboration with companies, and public and voluntary sector organisations, an activity that is termed 'co-production' research. Frith (2001, p.89) demonstrates the impact this has on academic staff by intimating that "so far this academic year I've spent far more time at meetings with potential commercial partners than I have at academic conferences…another consequence is the loss of any day-to-day sense of academic freedom". Lyotard's concept of 'performativity' is a useful concept

[29] Apart from comments on the significance of pedagogy to his thinking, his thoughts on the role of the intellectual, on the university as an important public space for democratic discussions, and on the significance of developing a disposition of criticality in all our students (Rizvi and Lingard, 2006).

[30] This notion of a "regime" is derived from Foucault's (1980) concept of "disciplinary regimes".

for framing the commodification of teaching and research (Barnett, 2000b) and also the various ways in which universities meet the new performative criteria with the emphasis on measurable outputs (Olssen and Peters, 2005). The following excerpts from tenured full professors (cited in Slaughter et al., 2004, p. 134) demonstrate the shifting boundaries in terms of academic's attitudes' towards private contract research and away from the previously highly coveted prize of federal (government) grants:

> When I was younger, I was very upset by the attitude of the chair of my department. He and the other thoroughbred academicians [said] that drug company money was dirty money and that's always been a notion in academia. That attitude has [since] changed (Professor, Biochemistry).
>
> Ah, 20 years ago…[participating in a start up company[31]] would have been thought, for an academic person, this would have been terrible…Some people still feel that way... Over the past 10-15 years, it's becoming much, much more common, but there are still people…older generation people who still think this is not a proper thing for an academic person to be doing, and that's inevitable there will be conflicts of interest somewhere along the line (Professor, Endocrinology).

Despite the drive for collaborations and networks (the *new circuits of knowledge*), Dimitriadis (2006) sees the resultant move towards specialised knowledge in the service of funding "niches" as a hyper-professionalisation of academics' work that is paradoxically driving academics to have greater individual responsibility, greater autonomy and a reduction in social responsibility:

> Our [academics] responsibilities are now increasingly diverted from broader public good towards narrow specialities and sub-specialities, along with their attendant journals, presses, conferences, honours, etc….As smaller and smaller numbers of academics manoeuvre and succeed in smaller and smaller corners of the world, large amounts of intellectual labour (adjuncts, part-timers) are simply being written off. Survival for the neo-liberal subject is now an individual responsibility, not a social one (Dimitriadis, 2006, p. 370).

[31] Start up companies include companies which professors started themselves or companies in which the professors receive stock equity in return for knowledge (Slaughter et al., 2004).

This hyper-professionalisation of academics' work is curiously opposite to the call from Said (1994) for 'amateurism in intellectual life'. Said (1994) argues that intellectuals are not professionals denatured by their fawning service to power, but should remain principled to enable them to speak the truth to power. Said (1994) sees professionalism as an attitude that represents a specific threat to the intellectual, and by professionalism he means:

> …thinking of your work as an intellectual as something you do for a living, between the hours of nine and five with one eye on the clock, and another cocked at what is considered to be proper, professional behaviour – not rocking the boat, not straying outside the accepted paradigms or limits, making yourself marketable and above all presentable, hence uncontroversial and unpolitical and 'objective' (Said, 1994, p. 55).

Giroux's (1995) notion of the educator [intellectual/academic] demonstrates support for Said's (1994) call for amateurism in intellectual life. Giroux (1995, p.140) rejects what he termed the "universal intellectual" and also the "specific intellectual", and presents the notion of the "border intellectual" who is not constrained by the accepted paradigms and limits of the professional intellectual. Importantly, Giroux (1995) maintains that border intellectuals *can* contribute to wider social issues:

> If the universal intellectual speaks for everyone, and the specific intellectual is wedded to serving the narrow interests of specific cultural and societal formations, the border intellectual travels within and across communities of difference working in collaboration with diverse groups and occupying many sites of resistance while simultaneously defying the specialised, parochial knowledge of the individual specialist, sage, or master ideologue…As border intellectuals, educators can articulate and negotiate their differences as part of a broader struggle to secure social justice, economic equality, and human rights within and across regional, national, and global spheres (Giroux, 1995, p.140).

3.4 The *End* of Knowledge: Challenge *or* Opportunity?

Having alluded to the paradox of professionalism of the academic/intellectual, the new circuits of knowledge forged through the university-industry-government partnerships emphasise a shift towards corporate principles of

efficiency, accountability and profit maximisation, and away from social responsibility. Henry Giroux highlights this move towards the new partnerships, and reinforces the sentiments of Dimitriadis (2006) and Davies (2005) that in the new economy academics no longer have the same responsibility to the social:

> …the modeling of higher education after corporate principles and the partnerships they create with the business community do more than reorient the purpose and meaning of higher education; such reforms also instrumentalise the curricula and narrow what it means to extend knowledge to broader social concerns (Giroux, 1999, p.19).

In the new circuits of knowledge, "knowledge no longer moves primarily within scientific/professional/scholarly networks" (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004, p. 22), and corporate 'outsiders' to the education profession now influence the production and dissemination of knowledge…something that Olssen and Peters (2005) see as the privatisation of knowledge production that has resulted in an age of 'knowledge capitalism'. This age of knowledge capitalism is a historically decisive moment[32], "in that knowledge is not only structured to be economically productive but itself becomes wholly a commodity under market conditions" (Halsey et al., 1997, p. 23) and therefore a site of contestation. Indeed, David (2007) states that both knowledge and methodological approaches to notions of research for and on/in higher education are increasingly becoming contested. Peer review is the cornerstone of the academic profession, and is no longer conducted exclusively by university members. Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) highlight the increase in numbers of industrial scholars[33] sitting on the National Science Foundation (NSF) peer review programmes as an indication of the shift as a result of the new circuits of knowledge created under an academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime. The consequences of the move away from public good knowledge/learning regime[34] is emphasised by Giroux (1999, p. 20):

> Research guided only by the controlling yardstick of profit undermines the role of the university as a public sphere dedicated to addressing the

[32] "Knowledge, after nearly a thousand years, is divorced from inwardness and is literally dehumanised" (Bernstein, 1990, p.136).
[33] Degree holders who work in industry.
[34] Based on Mertonian values of communalism, universalism, disinteredness, and organised scepticism. See Merton (1942) '*The normative structure of science*'.

> most serious social problems a society faces. Moreover, the corporate model of research instrumentalises knowledge and undermines forms of theorising, pedagogy, and meaning that define higher and public education as a public good rather than as a private good.

The instrumentalisation of knowledge that Giroux (1999) alludes to as redefining higher education away from a public good knowledge/learning regime, has led some commentators to suggest that we are witnessing 'the death of universities' (Evans, 2004/5) and 'the end of knowledge' (Barnett and Griffin, 1997; Delanty, 1998) in a higher education system that is in 'ruins' (Readings, 1996) and in 'crisis' (Frith, 2001)[35]. This move is captured in the following excerpt from a faculty member of a research-intensive institution who, for the last five years, has had significant research interactions with industry:

> In my mind, money is money…So long as it lets me do the science, that's all I care about. I mean, I don't think that it is seen as a negative, so long as I have money to do the science. I mean, it's not like we are getting it from drug traffickers or something like that (Assistant Professor, Biology, cited in Slaughter et al. (2004, p. 151).

The reconciling of competing values by academics and the acceptance of an industrialised, commercial view of higher education results in a culture of pessimism and weariness amongst the academic community. This is a concern shared by numerous commentators (Bone and McNay, 2006; Burgan, 2007; Schuster and Finkelstein, 2006; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997).

The 'end of knowledge thesis' argues substantively, ideologically and procedurally that the knowledge function of the university is at an end. Despite citing academic capitalism, the demise of contemplative knowledge, the need for knowledge to be cashable in some way in knowledge competences (Lyotard, 1984), the commodification of knowledge, an increase in the accountability of universities to the state, and the drive for transferable vocational skills, Barnett (2000a, p. 411) refuses to accept the 'end of the university' thesis:

[35] This is not to suggest that universities have not been in 'crisis' before. McSherry (2006) highlights that the American research university has gone through at least three distinct 'crises' in the past five decades alone.

> The forms of knowledge that the academic community has favoured may now be threatened; the monopoly over high status knowledge production that the university has enjoyed may be at an end. However the university is not at an end. New, even more challenging, roles are opening up for it, roles that still enable us to see continuities with its earlier self-understandings built around personal growth, societal enlightenment and the promotion of critical forms of understanding.

The shifting of the forms of knowledges[36] evident in the 'corporate' university that is under the influence of private sector companies – whose main business is the production of knowledge-based products (Kennedy-Wallace, 2000) – results in the function of universities being presented as existing along a continuum. At one end of the continuum, universities adopt the role as skills training centres, and at the other, universities become the research and development arms of the companies with educational functions attached as an appendage. Barnett (2000a) states that in essence the companies are looking to develop two sets of capacities: the knowledges and skills required developing new products; the knowledges and skills required for more effective and efficient management of those processes. Barnett (2000a, p.412) indicates that the very infrastructure of corporate universities is influenced directly as a result of this shifting of knowledges:

> Characteristically…there would be two 'faculties' in such [corporate] 'universities': a science and technological faculty built around certain sciences and technologies (for instance, biological sciences; electronic sciences; computational sciences) and a management studies faculty. Both 'faculties' would be organised with the particular needs of the company concerned in mind, the knowledges and skills being developed being framed in terms of that 'mission'.

The result of this is that universities – especially the 'old' universities – are feeling a challenge to their market share as a consequence of potential applicants to higher education going directly into industry, thus gaining paid employment *and* access to a corporate university. In addition to this, the challenge also exists over the production of knowledge and over their educational function through the knowledge organisations controlling knowledges that previously have been in the

[36] See Gibbons et al. (1994) '*The new production of knowledge*' for a detailed explanation of the characteristics of a dual conception of the epistemologies of 'Mode 1' (propositional) knowledge and the newly emerging 'Mode 2' knowledge (knowledge-in-use). For a critique of '*The new production of knowledge*' see Pestre (2000).

public domain[37], and by the way that invitations to tender for research projects, is no longer exclusively made to universities but increasingly an entirely open process including the private sector (Barnett, 2000a).

Essentially, Slaughter and Rhoades (2004, p.305) support Barnett's (2000a) less pessimistic outlook for higher education, and indicate that:

> The academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime is ascendant. It is *displacing*, but not *replacing*, others such as the public good knowledge regime or the liberal learning regime. Although other knowledge regimes persist, the trend line in emphasis and investment is the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime, as evidenced in public policy, in relations among market, state, and higher education organisations, and in the employment structure and work practices of the academy (emphases added).

The importance of 'displacing, but not replacing' other knowledge regimes indicate that although the current trend is towards the academic capitalist regime, this does not preclude the other regimes. Indeed, Slaughter and Rhoades (2004, p.305) argue that there are "possibilities of networks for socially productive purposes". This positive viewpoint is also shared by David (2007, p. 687 – emphasis added), who 'celebrates' the ways in which the new forms of academic capitalism "allow for a *diverse* and potentially inclusive form of higher education"[38]. This diversification of higher education knowledges is a move that Kincheloe and Steinberg (2006) would support, as it can nurture an institutional culture and a political will that allows for a challenge to the epistemological naïveté demonstrated in the education system, and ultimately be the catalyst towards the development of a critical education based on appreciation of difference. Indeed, Giroux (1995, p.130) states that "the university has long been linked to a notion of national identity that is largely defined and committed to transmitting traditional, Western culture"[39]. With diversity a possible outcome of the new forms of academic capitalism, this must in turn inform the work of

[37] Barnett (2000, p.413) cites "the potential patenting of human genetic material on the one hand, and forbidding the publication in journals of the reporting of new findings (so as to extract the maximum market leverage)" as examples.
[38] David (2007) cites some of the recent feminist and gender studies as painting a more optimistic picture of the future for women as academics and researchers in higher education.
[39] See Messner-Davidow (1993) *'Manufacturing the attack on liberalised higher education'* for an insightful analysis of the conservative attack on higher education

critical pedagogues, cultural studies practitioners, and antiglobalisation activists who have most consciously addressed issues of democracy, diversity, and social justice in the education system. Hytten (2006, p.223) states that recently:

> Critical educators have turned their attention to challenging the negative effects of globalisation…they worry that market-driven imperatives are increasingly directing educational decision making and that the needs of individuals have been overshadowed, and even sacrificed, in a narrow minded pursuit of economic profits.

With the objectives of critical pedagogy to empower the powerless and to transform social inequalities and injustices (McLaren, 2003) and, cultural studies considering the relationship among culture, knowledge, and power (Giroux, 1995), the critical educators need to accept the possibilities and opportunities for socially productive purposes presented by the new forms of academic capitalism. Darder and Mirón (2006) also state that the implementation of a critical pedagogy founded on Paulo Freire's (1972) groundbreaking work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, can within educational institutions see students excel both in their academic and civic participation. It should be remembered that "just as Marx reminded us that capitalism might actually be an improvement over feudalism, we may need to take seriously the possibility that some of the institutions behind new managerial impulses may also constitute an improvement over previous visions of university life" (Apple, 2005, p. 23).

The managerial impulses in higher education, has led to a blurring of the boundary between vocational and academic education in ways that reinforce the power of market forces (Frith, 2001). What some commentators might document as declining standards (Leathwood and Hutchings, 2003; Williams, 1997) by the development of new departments and degrees[40], others would perceive it as an opportunity to reflect new issues of pedagogic and research concern. Interestingly, Margaret Hodge (former Secretary of State for Lifelong Learning and Higher Education) sees the blurring of these boundaries as not representing a dumbing down of higher education because these students will not be going to

[40] Frith (2001, p.92) refers to these developments as "certificates of Bouncing and Beauty, which are clearly not academic".

study 'Greats at Oxford'. Thus, Hodge (2002) portrays the 'widening participation' and 'vocationalisation' issues as separate to an academic education, and therefore the increase in vocational courses, foundation degrees, and the development of sub-degree qualifications do not represent a decline in educational standards[41].

Education is increasingly becoming understood in terms of its *use* for students and employers, with both vocational and non-vocational programmes requiring a justification in utilitarian terms. Frith (2001, p.92) states that this leads to:

> …an ever more philistine functionalism. If universities have always had to justify themselves generally by reference to what they do for the economy, now this has to be done on a course by course basis. Any proposal for a new degree, or even a new class, has to begin with a statement of it's 'market', the competition from other universities, its 'transferable skills', its value to employers. The academic case for a new degree is made last and considered least.

As the university has been a site of considerable conflict over who can and can't go (Apple, 2005), the blurring of the boundary between vocational and academic education affords increasing opportunities to those students once excluded by an academic regime[42]. For example, in Britain, there has been a threefold increase in the number of universities since the 1960s[43], and a growth in consumers from 400,000 in the early 1960s to over 2,000,000 in the year 2000 (Greenaway and Haynes, 2003). Additionally, the public accountability resulting from the new managerial impulses can impact positively on the universities hiring practices:

> The intense struggles over the university's gendered and raced hiring practices, ones in which it has taken decades even to begin to address the cultural and social imbalances in serious ways, stand as eloquent witness to the continuing nature of the problems that need to be faced. Because of this, some forms of public accountability – to ask universities to provide evidence that they are taking seriously their social responsibilities

[41] See Lomas (2002) for an insightful discussion of whether the development of mass education necessarily means the end of quality.
[42] See Leathwood and O'Connell (2003) who unpick the construction of the 'new student' in higher education.
[43] As a result of the creation of around 20 new universities in the 1960s, and the removal of the 'binary divide' in the early 1990s, this resulted in over 40 polytechnics gaining university status. There are now almost 100 universities in the UK (Greenaway and Haynes, 2003).

> concerning hiring practices for example – were and continue to be partial victories (Apple, 2005, p. 23).

In essence, we should not be defending the discriminatory, racist, and elitist practices of the university, and embrace the opportunities afforded by the new forms of academic capitalism that now permeate through the higher education system.

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter has problematised the impact on academia of university integration into the new economy and the adoption of an academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime. This integration has 'forced' academia to promote a permeable interface through developing distinct collaborations and networks with knowledge businesses, the *new circuits of knowledge*, with academics now undertaking research with an emphasis on collaboration with companies, and public and voluntary sector organisations. The commodification and instrumentalisation of knowledge, although some perceive this shifting of the forms of knowledges as the 'end of the university', does in fact afford the opportunity for the academic community to engage in practices that *can* contribute to wider social issues (Giroux, 1995). In light of abandoning university knowledge as a pure, objective reading of the world, Barnett (2000a) calls for universities to adopt a new critical function, developing a new epistemology for the university within the context of neoliberal influences. In embracing this opportunity for a new critical function, scholars can feel empowered in seeking a challenge to existing taken-for-granted knowledges in established 'fields' of research; such as the position afforded to current scholarly activity in the 'field' of sports coaching research.

CHAPTER 4: Conjunctural History of the Sports Coaching Present

> Question: How may people would willingly sit in front of their television sets for five weeks to watch 64 games in which 11 overpaid athletes try to move an inflated leather ball across a 24-foot line, while another 11 try to move the same ball across another line 100 yards away?
>
> Answer: 37 billion, including 1.7 billion – a quarter of the world's total population – for the final 90 minutes alone[44] (Cashmore, 2000, p.1).

4.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to *locate* the 'theme field' of sports coaching research within the critical interrogation of sport. "It is impossible to fully understand contemporary society and culture without acknowledging the place of sport" (Jarvie, 2006, p.2) and indeed the importance that is placed on sport by nation states and global associations *must* be mapped out to fully appreciate the conjunctural history of the sports coaching present. This chapter will emphasise that sport is not impervious to the characteristics of the 'pernicious present' (Silk and Andrews, in press), whether that is neoliberal ideology, politics or the forces of globalisation.

In the UK, the leisure industry – of which sport is the fastest growing sector – accounts for over a quarter of all consumer spending (Davies, 2002), with sport-related employment (which would include professional sports coaches) estimated as accounting for 1.8% of all employment in England in 2003 (Sport England, 2007). The commercial impact of sport is also difficult to overlook when we are confronted with headlines such as 'Premier league wages break the £1 billion barrier' (The Telegraph, 2008) or that the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games attracted more than US $600 million in sponsorship and was viewed on television by more

[44] Data cited is for the soccer World Cup in 1998. Note that these figures cited in Cashmore (2000) have been criticised as being vastly overinflated (See The Independent, 2007 '*Why Fifa's claim of one billion TV viewers was a quarter right*').

than 3.7 billion people (Jarvie, 2006)[45]. In addition to these commercial factors sport's social power make it a "potentially potent force in the modern world, for good or bad" (Jarvie, 2006, p.2). The United Nations declared 2005 to be the Year of Sport and Physical Education (Coalter, 2007), and with more and more children participating in organised sport around the world (De Knopp et al., 1996) there is an acknowledgement that sport can be the vehicle for addressing a wide range of social issues.

This chapter will initially look at the influences of political ideology on sports policy and then unpick the role that sport has on a global scale. The genealogy of sports coaching as an academic endeavour is considered and then the current sports coaching research landscape is presented and then critiqued.

4.2 Sport Policy

Houlihan (2004, p.67) describes the role of the state in determining the pattern, momentum and direction of the engagement between national and global sport as substantial and central "due to the dependence of almost all national sport systems on state funding and administrative support". As a consequence of this the policy objectives that the government seek to achieve through sport are an integral component shaping the current sporting moment and the sporting space that we inhabit. The idea that sport is not a part of politics or has nothing to do with politics – the myth of autonomy[46] – has been marginalised as utopian ideology (Maguire et al., 2002). Chapters 2 and 3 demonstrated how neoliberal ideology has influenced policy formation in the field of higher education and then subsequently how this has impacted on the role of academia, and as sports policy occupies a contested space on the edge of mainstream government policies, an understanding of the policy processes can crucially be gained through an appreciation of the ideology shaping them (Bramham, 2004).

[45] It is not the purpose of this paper to give a detailed account of the economic impacts of sport in the UK or indeed its global impact. See Coalter (2007) for an intuitive description of '*The economic impacts of sport: investing in success?*'

[46] The persistent assertion that sport was somehow separate from society (Allison, 1993).

The major political ideologies of conservatism, liberalism and social reformism each define their preferred association between nation state, civil society and markets in a different manner, and as a consequence would present different prescriptions for public policy. Numerous writers have unpicked what sports policies would look like if driven directly by a political ideology (For example: Bramham and Henry, 1985; Bramham and Henry, 1991; Henry, 2001; Riordan, 1978; Riordan and Krüger, 1999; Sam and Jackson, 2004; Wilson, 1988; Whannel, 1983)[47] and in addition to this there is a burgeoning range of literature giving detailed histories of the development of sports policy in the United Kingdom (For example: Haywood et al., 1995; Houlihan, 1991; Houlihan and White, 2002).

Demonstrating how a political ideology is manifested in public policy is highly visible with the transition to the Labour government in May 1997. The dominant core policy paradigm shaping the early years of the Blair government was social reformism, with "its concern to promote moral, urban and economic regeneration reflected in its commitment to address social exclusion and its support for economic modernisation and creative excellence" (Houlihan and White, 2002, p.81). Coalter (2007, p.1) supports Houlihan and White's (2002) assertion about social reformism, and further adds to the discussion the dimension of the new importance of sport in social policy that has then resulted in an emphasis on measurement, evaluation and effectiveness[48]:

> In recent years sport has achieved an increasingly high profile as part of New Labour's social inclusion agenda, based on assumptions about its potential contribution to areas such as social and economic regeneration, crime reduction, health improvement and educational achievement. However these new health opportunities (welcomed by many in sport) have been accompanied by a potential threat – evidence-based policy-making. This reflects an increased emphasis on outcomes and effectiveness and an aspiration to base policy and practice on robust evidence to ensure the delivery of the government's policy goals.

[47] Recent high level of academic interest has been shown for future analysis of sport policy by utilising major models and frameworks for analysis adopted in other policy areas. See Houlihan (2005) '*Public Sector Sport Policy*'.
[48] Parallels can be drawn between this and the 'audit culture' noted by Apple (2005) permeating education in the 1980s.

As many of the branches of central government have a vested interest in the value of sport[49], co-operation between different branches of government was seen as the way to break down the traditional culture of departmentalism to allow for a comprehensive policy response to a complex and multi-dimensional problem – a process that Houlihan and White (2002) term 'joined up government'. Priority was given to bringing the three most important departments together that were concerned with sport policy, the Department of Culture, Media and Sports (DCMS), the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) and the Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR). In addition to this, the Sports Councils, the regional assemblies (Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales) and regional consortiums in England "added a further dimension to the infrastructure of the policy process" (Houlihan and White, 2002, p.81). The DCMS (2000) strategy '*A Sporting Future for All*' is a reflection on the 'joined up' policy process, using schools at the heart of the policy as the vehicle for development of participation in sport and also talent identification and elite achievement (Houlihan and White, 2002). To ensure the fulfilment of the 'evidence-based policy-making loop', evidence needs to be accumulated to inform sports policy, provision and practice in a range of areas:

> In sports policy several research reviews were commissioned by government and public organizations to examine the evidence for sport's claimed wider impacts and to identify 'good practice' models as a basis for policy[50]. However…the overall conclusion of these reviews was that there was a general lack of robust research-based evidence[51] on the outcomes of sports participation" (Coalter, 2007, pp.25-26).

It is important to emphasise that, as previously mentioned, Coalter (2007) sees evidence-based policy-making as a threat due to the lack of robust research evidence on which policies are derived. Indeed, he reflects on the disappointment of his commissioning clients (Sport England and UK sport) to the ambiguous and inconclusive conclusions drawn from all reviews produced

[49] See the pre-election policy statement from the Labour Party (1996) '*Labour's sporting nation*'.
[50] For example '*Sport and social exclusion*' (Collins et al., 1999); '*The role of sport in regenerating deprived urban areas*' (Coalter et al., 2000); '*Game plan*' (DCMS and Strategy Unit, 2002); '*The benefits of sport*' (Coalter, 2005).
[51] Coalter (2007) attributes the lack of a strong cumulative body of research evidence from which to inform sport policy and practice to four broad factors: conceptual weaknesses; methodological weaknesses; little consideration of sufficient conditions; limitations of narrative reviews.

(with John Taylor) to the on-line research database the '*Value of Sport Monitor*'. Coalter (2007, p.1) describes the findings at best "equivalent to the Scottish legal verdict of 'not proven'. There are no 'killer facts' and few 'best buys'".

The vested interest that central government has in relation to sport is posited by Bramham (2008, p.10) who concisely differentiates intrinsic and extrinsic *objectives* obtained from sport:

> Sport may be valued intrinsically for its own sake because it develops personal skills, competition, individual self-esteem and fun for participants. Sport can also produce wider externalities, by making a valuable contribution to other government policy with respect to national prestige[52], to foreign policy and international diplomacy, to tourism and city regeneration, to local community development, to health, as well as helping to redress social divisions around class, 'race', gender and disability.

Successive Conservative and Labour governments set up quangos such as the Arts Council, the Sports Council and agencies to distribute National Lottery funds. Bramham (2008) suggests that this 'arm's length' approach to policy has been both politically and ideologically expedient by providing institutional continuity and allowing governments to provide subsidy and appoint key personnel without being held directly accountable in Parliament for decisions and outcomes. Bramham (2008, p.19) emphasises that this is in no way a reflection of governments dismissing the power of sports wider externalities:

> This is in no way to suggest that sports policy is an ideologically battle-free zone. Sports policy cannot avoid moral panics in the media about national elite sports performance, alcohol and drug abuse, football hooliganism, racism and sexism, childhood obesity and so on. The sports policy universe is inevitably drawn into each government's political ideology and political agenda.

It is the capability of the 'sports policy universe' to help contribute to wider government policy goals that in essence facilitates a certain permanence for sports policies no matter what the ideological script the transient government is

[52] For some insightful discussion surrounding the power that sport has *impacting* national prestige in other Western countries (Canada, Finland and Austria) see: Jackson and Ponic (2001), Laine (2006) and Horak and Spitaler (2003).

working from at a particular moment in time. It should be remembered however that linking sport policy to the wider government agenda can be critiqued. Bloom et al. (2005, preface) concludes that "policy makers lack the evidence required to make informed policy decisions and to connect sport issues to other policy priorities" and indeed not only is there a lack of systematic, robust measurement of outcomes, but also a deficiency in the understanding of "the mechanisms and processes via which they are achieved (especially in 'real life' situations)" (Coalter et al., 2000, p.85). Coalter (2007) indicates that in sport policy making there is a marked difference between the theoretical logic of evidence-based policy making and what happens in reality. Coalter (2007, p.26) uses Weiss's (1997b) vivid phrase to highlight that "sports policy and practice has been, and continues to be not 'aim, steady fire', but 'fire, steady, aim'!"

4.3 Globalisation, the Nation State and Sport: A Global Role for Sport?

To fully explicate the current moment, it is essential that consideration of sport is not limited to the national level, and that reflection on the global role for sport is considered in tandem with it. The term 'global sport' and the associated processes of globalisation are common within discussions of contemporary sport (Jarvie, 2006). Indeed, Jarvie (2006) usefully differentiates these discussions as operating at two levels, the globalisation of sport itself and also the contribution that sport makes to other globalisation processes. The *success* of the market economy and the vindication of Western capitalism that occurred in the late 1980s/early 1990s were critiqued in the context of individuals and societies in Chapter 2 to frame the current moment and the time and space that we inhabit. To help articulate the conjunctural history of the sports present, Houlihan (2004, p.53) cites that the same chain of events were responsible for the concept of *globalisation* to be applied to the sporting context:

> The stimulus for the enthusiastic embrace of the concept of globalisation in the early 1990s was due less to the spread of particular cultural practices, or the recognition of the global commercial interests in major sporting events such as the Olympics and the soccer World Cup, and

> more to the collapse of communism and the end of global political and economic bipolarity.

The use of the term 'enthusiastic embrace' in relation to globalisation confirms Houlihan's (2004) belief that globalisation is assuming paradigmatic status, or has become "the new grand narrative of the social sciences" (Hirst and Thompson, 1999, p.xiii). There are numerous critiques of this position (For example: Baker et al., 1999; Bauman, 2000; Dearlove, 2000; Maguire, 1999; Michie and Grieve-Smith, 1999; Weiss, 1997a) and what is of importance here is that the critiques challenge the undifferentiated identity of the global and juxtapose that the global and national (nation state) need not present competing principles of organisation but can indeed be complementary to one another. Interestingly, these thoughts are synonymous with the call for the *production of locality* (Hardt and Negri, 2000)[53] with the need for the local (nation state) to work symbiotically with, and not subordinate to, global influences in sport.

It is therefore important to ensure that the utility of the concept [globalisation] that is applied to the field of sport is examined "as there is a risk that it will become degraded and exhausted through indiscriminate use and constant challenge from its critics, and consequently move to the 'back-burner' in social science" (Houlihan, 2004, p.53). Interestingly Jarvie (2006) concedes that the term globalisation has been poorly defined, meaning different things to different people, and that there is no single globalisation theory upon which an understanding of contemporary sport can be built. However, Houlihan (2004, p.53) uses the debate about the utility of the concept of globalisation to "sharpen our understanding of the development of sport as it continues to move beyond the confines of national policy systems, and particularly the part played by the state in the process".

Coakley (2001, p.389) intimates that Government involvement in sports is frequently motivated by a quest for "recognition and prestige…on local, national and even global levels". Although it is not the purpose of this chapter to unpick

[53] Discussion about considering the local debate in chapter 2 on '*The rise of neo-liberalism*' (section 2.2).

government rationales for their use of sport[54], in defining the sporting moment distinction needs to be made between how and why a nation state *uses* sport on a global platform and also how global associations of governments (for example the United Nations) *use* sport. Bramham (2008, p.22) presents the transcending of sports policy beyond nation state boundaries:

> In a globalised world in which transnational economic, environmental, security and cultural forces reign supreme, even transcending nation state boundaries, sports policies continue to offer national governments the illusory temptation that ideologically based interventions can make a difference. Whether in bidding for mega-events, changing mass participation rates in sport, or using activities to regulate disorderly youth, sports policy remains, and has even grown in political salience in the twenty-first century.

The hosting of one of sports mega-events[55] in the UK – the 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games – is a prime example of how a government utilises sport for wider policy objectives[56]. The DCMS (2008, p.3) strategy document '*Before, during and after: making the most of the London 2012 Games*' sets out an action plan containing five 'promises' in relation to hosting the Games: to make the UK a world-leading sporting nation; to transform the heart of East London; to inspire a generation of young people; to make the Olympic Park a blueprint for sustainable living; to demonstrate the UK is a creative, inclusive and welcoming place to live in, visit and for business[57]. Interestingly only one of the promises relates to sport and even this promise can be critiqued for being 'diluted' with broader social objectives. The promise to 'make the UK a world-leading sporting nation' has as one of its headline ambitions 'elite achievement: aim for 4th in the Olympic medal table in 2012' with 'UK Sport's World Class Performance Programme' as the key programme responsible for delivery of this (DCMS, 2000). Houlihan and White (2002, p.109) suggest that "the government demonstrated an awareness of the tendency of NGBs [National Governing

[54] For a detailed discussion on the sports-government connection, see Allison, 1993; Houlihan, 1994; Maguire et al., 2002; Wilson, 1994.
[55] There is a growing base of academic literature around the sociology of sports-mega events. For an overview of this field of study, see Horne and Manzenreiter (2006) '*An introduction to the sociology of sports mega-events*'.
[56] For an insightful discussion on wider issues surrounding hosting the Olympic Games, see Magdalinski (2000) '*The reinvention of Australia for the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games*'.
[57] Each of the 'promises' has a range of 'key programme' policies aimed at achieving the 'headline ambitions' stated in the document.

Bodies of sports] to adopt an overly narrow focus on elite achievement" and as a consequence NGBs were tasked with diverting resources towards social objectives. NGBs needed to "have a clear strategy for participation *and* excellence; and commit themselves to putting social inclusion and fairness at the heart of everything that they do" (DCMS, 2000, p.22 – emphasis added).

"Sports 'mega-events' are important elements in the orientation of nations to international or global society" (Horne and Manzenreiter, 2006, p.1) and this concept of an international or global society reflects concerns that Houlihan (2004, p.68) and other academics[58] share about the erosion of hard edged national identity[59]:

> Under conditions of globalised sport the concept of hard-edged, clearly defined and recognised national identity would give way to a more fluid, ambiguous and malleable concept, according to which athletes and club teams would reflect multiple or nested identities that would, arguably, be more sympathetic to commercial strategies of global media and business.

Nation States have colluded in the dilution of national identity by issuing naturalisation or work permits to foreign athletes, however Houlihan (2004, p.68) intimates that there are signs of a reaction[60] from national and international federations and also a number of member states in the EU (including Britain and France) "which perceive a threat to the development of national talent and the integrity of domestic sport systems". Indeed, Houlihan (2004, p.69) suggests that with:

> The continuing significance of the state in shaping domestic engagement with international sport and the evidence of a strengthening capacity of the states, both individually and collectively…it is more accurate to talk of internationalised, rather than globalised, sport.

Introducing the concept of an *internationalised* rather than globalised sport due to the individual and collective strengthening of the states is an important link to

[58] See for example Poli (2007) '*The denationalization of sport: de-ethnicization of the nation and identity deterritorialization*'.
[59] For a useful discussion on '*Sport, nationalisms and their futures*' see Reid and Jarvie (2000).
[60] Particularly in soccer and other team sports (Houlihan, 2004).

how global associations of governments *use* sport. Not only is sport attributed a role in the search for solutions to social issues in the UK[61], "even greater and much more ambitious claims are being made for sport on a global scale, as sport is increasingly regarded as an important component of development strategies" (Coalter, 2007, p.68) for promoting education, health, the economy, gender equality and peace. Although it is not the purpose of this chapter to unpick the global role for sport[62] the emphasis placed on the developmental power of sport by the global association of governments (the United Nations) can not be overlooked in the context of this research enquiry in defining the current sport space that we inhabit. Louise Fréchette (the UN Deputy Secretary-General – emphases added) speaking at the opening address of the World Sport's Forum in March 2000, stated that:

> The power of sports is far more than symbolic. You are engines of *economic* growth. You are a force for gender equality. You can bring youth and others in from the margins, strengthening the social fabric. You can promote communication and help heal the divisions between peoples, communities and entire nations. You can set an example of fair play. Last but not least, you can advocate a strong and effective United Nations. There may not be any miracle finishes or perfect performances. But if we are even half as motivated and dedicated as the typical athlete, the *sporting world*, the *business community* and the United Nations can prove to be quite a winning team.

In Fréchette's (2000) opening address, the economic rationale for sport can be seen to have primacy over the developmental agenda. However, in explicating how sport is integral in the work for peace and to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (United Nations, 2005a)[63], the United Nations omits the economic rationale to emphasise the wide ranging developmental role that sport can have:

> It [sport] is about inclusion and citizenship. Sport brings individuals and communities together, highlighting commonalities and bridging cultural

[61] Also in other countries such as Canada and Australia to a lesser extent (Coalter, 2007).
[62] For an articulate discussion on a global role for sport, see Coalter (2007) chapter 5 '*Sport in development*'.
[63] These 8 goals include eradicating extreme poverty and hunger, universal primary education, promoting gender equality and empowering women, combating HIV/AIDS, and reducing child mortality. See United Nations (2005b) '*The Millennium Goals Report 2005*' for fuller details.

> or ethnic divides. Sport provides a forum to learn skills such as discipline, confidence and leadership and it teaches core principles such as tolerance, cooperation and respect. Sport teaches the value of effort and how to manage victory, as well as defeat. When these positive aspects of sport are emphasized, sport becomes a powerful vehicle through which the United Nations can work towards achieving its goals (United Nations, 2005c, p.v).

Jarvie (2006) does however present a cautionary note to the role of global sport, describing global sport as nothing more than neoliberalism and equates to market forces controlling sport. Indeed, contradictorily to the positive portrayal of sports global mega-events by governments, Andrews (2004, p.17 – emphasis added) intimates that this aura is fallacious:

> Politics, corruption and commercialisation have been an ever-present aspect of the modern Olympic movement since its inception with the Athens games of 1896. Nevertheless, even in the *hypercommercial* world of late twentieth-century sport, the Olympic Games somehow managed to maintain an aura – however spurious and symbolic – of sporting purity and unity seemingly unsullied by the world around it.

In direct opposition to sport as the *vehicle* through which the United Nations can achieve its goals, Jarvie (2006, p.95 – emphasis added) cites global sport and globalisation as:

> …being the *vehicle* of global exploitation which has produced sports goods on the back of cheap labour, helped maintain global poverty levels and maintained different levels of inequality in sport, particularly in terms of access of women and ethnic minority groups to positions of power in global sport.

Thus, there is a need for sport to seek to replace the traditional, Western power bases to allow for any strategies aimed at producing change to go beyond the dualism that portrays globalisation as good or bad and towards considering the multiple levels[64] in a unitary and totalising manner.

[64] Jarvie (2006, p.96) states that "at a minimal illustrative level globalisation can be articulated at the level of politics, culture, economics, technology and society".

4.4 The Rise of Sports Coaching as an Academic Endeavour

Having critically interrogated 'sport' on a national and global level, it is now essential to explicate the rise of sports coaching as an academic endeavour, framed by the current 'moment'. In the practice of sports coaching there is an inexorable link between knowledge and competence. A designated level of competence and acquired knowledge is assumed if an individual obtains a 'sports coaching' related qualification. In research conducted by Pullo (1992) on strength and conditioning coaches, three of the characteristics in the profile of an 'effective' coach were formal coaching/sport related qualifications, including degree (and higher degree) level study. Jones (2005a) alludes to the recent recognition of sports coaching (i.e. improving the sporting performance of others) as a bone fide area of academic study, alongside the more established subject areas of sport psychology and exercise physiology. The latest undergraduate and postgraduate admissions data for the UK indicates that, not only has coaching become established alongside the more traditional subject areas, it is eclipsing them in terms of provision at Higher Education (HE) institutions.

An undergraduate course search (UCAS, 2008a) reveals that, of the 1783 undergraduate (excluding foundation degree) sport courses with entry in 2008, 210 (11.8%) concentrate on sports coaching, while the closely-linked specialism of sport education accounts for 69 (3.9%) programmes. The more established areas of sport psychology and sport/exercise physiology are the basis of 104 (5.8%) and 40 (2.2%) programmes respectively. It should be noted that the umbrella term 'sport science' (incorporating aspects of sociology, physiology, psychology and biomechanics) accounts for 800 (44.9%) programmes. These data when compared with comparable data from 2006[65] highlight the dynamic fluidity of undergraduate sports programmes. The emerging trend is a reduction in the umbrella programme of 'sports science', from 1054 (62.7%) programmes in 2006 (Bush, 2007), 800 (44.9%) programmes commencing in 2008, down to

[65] 1745 undergraduate sport courses in 2006, of which 192 (11.0%) concentrated on sports coaching, 90 (5.2%) sport education, 67 (3.8%) sport psychology, 18 (1.0%) sport/exercise physiology, 1054 (62.7%) 'sports science' (Bush, 2007).

765 (43.8%)[66] programmes commencing in 2009 (UCAS, 2008b), and a concomitant increase in sports coaching undergraduate programmes from 192 (11.0%) to 217 (12.4%) programmes commencing in 2009 (UCAS, 2008b). With overall sport undergraduate provision remaining constant, the dramatic reduction in 'sports science' programmes (from 62.7% of the undergraduate sports provision in 2006 to 43.8% in 2009) has also allowed for an eclectic mix of 'sports' related undergraduate programmes to proliferate to fill the void[67].

Similar positive results are found when looking at postgraduate study in sport. A postgraduate course search (The Guardian, 2008) indicated that 54 institutions offered postgraduate qualifications in a sport-related field, of which 11 (20.4%) of the institutions offered sports coaching programmes. Coaching is not only flourishing as an academic subject at both undergraduate and postgraduate level, but is also emerging as a popular option in the more vocational HE qualifications (foundation degrees). Of the 224 foundation degrees in sport (including 'Sports Studies' and 'Sports Science')[68], 62 (27.7%) include 'coaching' or 'coach' in the programme title (UCAS, 2008c).

The expansion of coaching as an academic area of study is mirrored by its increased appearance in government policy. The prospect of hosting the Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2012 has provided a driving force for the recruitment and support of current and future coaches, which is seen as critical in ensuring a sporting legacy to reach beyond the 2012 Games (sports coach UK, 2006). Sports coach UK has been tasked with the development of a UK Action Plan for Coaching[69] in conjunction with national governing bodies of sport (NGBs) and the key funding agencies (UK Sport; the Department for Culture, Media and Sport; Home Country Sports Councils; the Department for Education and Skills; the British Olympic Association; Youth Sport Trust and SkillsActive). The 'UK Coaching Framework: A 3-7-11 Action Plan' incorporates a range of initiatives, including a fast-track scheme for the

[66] 1745 undergraduate sports courses commencing in 2009 (UCAS, 2008b).
[67] 41 different 'sport' programmes commencing in 2008 (UCAS, 2008a).
[68] Programmes commencing in 2008.
[69] In January 2007 'The UK Action Plan for Coaching' was renamed to 'The UK Coaching Framework: A 3-7-11 Action Plan'.

production of 60 elite British coaches by 2012, the UK Coaching Certificate (UKCC) to endorse coach education programmes against agreed criteria, and the establishment of 3000 Community Sports Coaches (CSCs) and a network of 45 Coach Development Officers (CDOs). The Coaching Task Force report published in July 2002 resulted in the Government committing £28 million over a three-year period to coaching (DCMS, 2006a), and £60 million ring fenced between 2004 and 2008 to implement the UK Action Plan for Coaching (DCMS, 2006b). The Government having also confirmed the allocation of £300 million to the athlete preparations for London 2012 (DCMS, 2006c), a significant investment is secured for coaching for the foreseeable future.

4.5 The Current Sports Coaching 'Research' Landscape

According to Gilbert and Trudel (2004a, p.388) "the development of any profession relies on research, training programs and innovations in practice. These endeavours, however, depend on knowledge of the current state of the field". Throughout the infancy of sports coaching research, debate surrounded the notion that coaching was essentially either a scientific or artistic activity, or even a blend of the two. The perception of coaching as a science implies that specific acquired knowledge can be prescribed in order to bring about incremental performance improvements. In comparison to coaching as a science, coaching as an art form results in performance improvement without rational, instrumental application of knowledge but through applying knowledge to a dynamic, complex environment in a less prescriptive, more creative and mystical manner. The perspective of coaching being a composite of science and art is supported by a number of coach educators (see Lyle, 1986; Potrac et al., 2000), although there are proponents for coaching being mainly scientific (see Balyi, 1992; Bompa, 1996; Bompa, 1999a; Bompa 1999b), or artistic (see Dick, 1989). Whichever perspective is adopted, there are important implications for the knowledge that underpins each. Woodman (1993, pp.1-2) highlights the major areas of science that are impacting on coaching, "anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, biomechanics, growth and development, statistics, tests and measurements, motor learning, psychology, sports medicine, nutrition, pedagogy,

sociology, and information and communication technology". The complex nature of the art of coaching, according to Woodman (1993, p. 4), emphasises the requirement for the coach to develop knowledge of a different kind:

> The coach, like the artist, must have creative flair and technical mastery over the material and tools used. In his [Dick, 1989] analogy the athlete is the instrument and the material, but, being an adaptive and reasoning being, is very complex to work with. Dick states that the coach must clearly understand the purpose of each practice and its relevance to the total scheme of preparation, while at the same time understand the growing, changing person of the athlete and the role of sport in his or her life.

Whether one predominantly supports a science or an art base to the profession, coaches must increase their knowledge in all aspects to be 'fully effective'. If we accept this holistic view of sports coaching and concede that a coach requires facets of both perspectives, then the debate *between* the two perspectives is now redundant:

> Lyle (1986) concludes that coaching is neither an art nor a science but a little of both. Lyle says that sports performance is not an exact science and that the individuality of the coach, decision-making based on experience, and the vagaries of the psychological aspects of performance point to human factors as a key part of the process (Woodman, 1993, p. 5).

In reality, this is what we see 'on the ground', with coaches blending relevant components derived from both perspectives. As the science/art debate subsided in the late 1980s, there was a need for a new characterisation of research perspectives on coaching.

Presenting an overview of sports coaching and coach education research is a tremendous challenge considering the amount of coaching literature (Trudel and Gilbert, 2006), and despite a burgeoning body of coaching literature few attempts have been made to summarise the information (Hastie, 1992). In Gilbert and Trudel's (2004a) 'Analysis of Coaching Science Research Published from 1970-2001' the published research on 'coaching science' (the 'theme field') was conceptually defined as a composition of 'theory fields' (e.g. sport psychology, sport pedagogy, sport biomechanics, sport sociology) linked to a 'mother

science' (e.g. psychology, pedagogy, sociology). Ultimately the coaching research was organised into four research categories (coach behaviours, coach thoughts, coach characteristics, and coach career development) that were drawn from 54 coaching themes. Interestingly, Gilbert and Trudel's (2004a) data demonstrates that 'coaching scientists' traditionally have been most interested in what coaches do, representing 50.7% of all articles coded from 1970-2001 and 55.7% of articles coded in the most recent time period of analysis (1998-2001). This is supported by Douge and Hastie (1993) who intimated that coaching research tended to be a one-dimensional evaluation of coach behaviours.

Current scholarly activity can be seen to be underpinned by four approaches to sports coaching (Jones, 2005a). These are: psychological (see Bloom et al., 2003; Brewer and Jones, 2002; d'Arrippe-Longueville et al., 1998; Gilbert and Trudel, 2004b), modelling (see Côté et al., 1995; Cross and Lyle, 1999; Lyle, 2002; Sherman et al., 1997), sociological (see Cassidy et al., 2004; Jones, 2000; Jones et al., 2004; Jones et al., 2003; Lombardo, 1987; Potrac et al., 2002) and pedagogical (see Jones, 2005b; Jones and Wallace, 2005; Kidman, 2001; Potrac et al., 2000). It should be noted that these four approaches are not independent of each other; many of the authors who are identified as aligning with a particular approach might argue that to place their work in a particular category is an over-simplification, and that in a number of cases sports coaching research blurs the allocated boundaries. A presentation of the concepts central to each of the four approaches follows.

According to Jones (2005a), the parent discipline of coaching is psychology. Proponents of a psychological approach to coaching relate to the idea that 'it is all in the mind' and focus on areas such as decision making, skill acquisition, coach–athlete interactions, the role of the coach, self-esteem and cognition. Scholars working in this area see the development of sports coaching research as being parallel to the progress in psychological understanding. Historically, sport coaching was aligned with widely accepted and established behavioural and cognitive principles, before being enhanced by a branch of psychology that added the human dimension, namely humanistic psychology. This 1950s' development within psychology has remained a domineering influence over

contemporary sports coaching research. This was demonstrated by Lyle (2002) embracing the humanistic approach as a 'benchmark' for behaviour in sports coaching. Recent developments in the field of psychology continue to inform contemporary sports coaching research, which has largely remained faithful to the psychological approach.

The modelling approach to coaching is based on the premise that 'coach effectiveness' or 'coaching success' can be achieved through the identification, analysis and control of variables that affect athlete performance, and the application of a sequential process. This sequential view of coaching conveniently allows for modification of the process to achieve success. The modelling perspective is highlighted by Kidman and Hanrahan (2004, p.16); "if coaches are not achieving success (however it is defined), they need to look at changing what they are doing, that is, changing the process". Jones (2005a) describes the existence of two forms of research within this approach to sports coaching, 'models of' the coaching process that are based on empirical research investigating effective coaching practice, and 'models for' the coaching process as *idealistic representations* that develop from the identification of a set of assumptions about the process[70]. Douge and Hastie (1993) identify that there is a clear research gap that requires context specific work to be undertaken, and that the modelling approach does not consider effectively the different needs that individuals have at different stages of their development that would require a diversification in the coaching environments (Martindale et al., 2005). Indeed, Trudel (2006) concedes that to 'model' coaching is a complex task as it would need to consider the influences of both the coach and athlete's personal characteristics, and also the specific contextual factors of the coaching environment.

The precursor to a sociological approach to coaching according to Jones (2005a) was a perceived dissatisfaction with the presentation of coaching as a sequential process, which was felt to be an oversimplification of a much more complex

[70] The model of Côté et al. (1995) is an example of a model 'of' coaching. It was developed based on high performance gymnastics coaches and has since been *validated* with team and combat sports.

procedure. Jones et al. (2004, p.2) indicate that "a professional coach is much more than a subject matter specialist and a systematic method applier". The sociological approach is concerned with looking at issues largely ignored by the psychological and modelling approaches to sports coaching, often the elements defined as 'intuition', 'wisdom', or the 'art of coaching'. Key issues dealt with under the sociological approach are the acquisition; maintenance and advancement of social power; the constructionist nature of coaching knowledge; the social role of the coach; coaches' philosophies; coaches' agency; coaches' interactions; the coaching environment and the pedagogic setting. In essence, scholarly activity within this approach aims to question the practices presented in other research perspectives (and often taken for granted) that portray an "oddly inhuman account of this most human of jobs" (Connell, 1985, p. 4).

A pedagogical approach to sports coaching encroaches into the territory of the sociological approach in the area of the learning [coaching] environment, referred to in this context as the 'pedagogic setting'. The pedagogic approach is based on the premise that coaching is fundamentally a teaching activity, with the goal being athlete learning. In addition to the identifiable links to the sociological approach, the roots of the scholarly activity defined as a pedagogical approach to sports coaching are also linked to sports coaching's parent discipline, psychology. The behaviourist nature of the pedagogic approach to sports coaching defines the topics that are open to investigation; they must be observable and measurable. Deviation from the psychological approach to sports coaching occurs as the development of an individual's cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies, and other internal processes, are not considered. Jones (2005a) suggests that this approach to sports coaching has provided useful information, but its one-dimensional view cannot be generalised across contexts. Despite its limitations, recently there has been an emergence of scholarly activity that has used educational theory to reconceptualise sports coaching as a critical pedagogical process (see Jones, 2005b; Jones and Wallace, 2005).

Authors would concede that a blurring of the boundaries between the four approaches to sports coaching does exist, opening up the possibility of scholarly activity being increasingly reflective of the more complex nature of coaching and

utilising a broader range of theory fields. For example, drawing on ideas from social psychology and using a combination of the assumptions made in both the sociological and psychological approaches to sports coaching, Bowes and Jones (2006) used relational schemas and complexity theory to put forward an alternative theoretical framework for a more realistic conception of coaching. What Bowes and Jones (2006) seek to do is to familiarise coaches and coach educators with the reality that coaching is in essence a complex, interactive process, and that the understanding of different concepts of coaching will ultimately make coaches better prepared to cope with the demands placed upon them. In emphasising the need for coach education to take a fuller account of the interactive, social nature of coaching, Bowes and Jones (2006) demonstrate the importance of moving beyond more traditional coach education models towards a presentation of coaching as a dynamic process that takes place within the social arena and not in isolation.

The previous discussion using Jones' (2005a) characterisation of research into sports coaching, explicitly covers three of Gilbert and Trudel's (2004a) research categories – coach behaviours, coach thoughts, and coach characteristics – however coach career development, that would be subsumed into the 'modelling' approach is a research category that is emerging as one of key importance[71] and therefore in need of further discussion. Lyle (2008, p.214) highlights that "government proposals for the professionalisation of coaching have a clear developmental context, and the discourse is directed to community sport and high performance sport[72]". In addition to this, Lyle (2008, p.215) presents sport coaching as a key component of sport provision:

> Part of sport participation is dependent to a greater or lesser extent on sport leadership, teaching, instruction or coaching. In so far as sports development is a process that is intended to lead to increased sport participation, more sustained participation or improved standards of performance, sport coaching (as a collective term) becomes an extremely

[71] Coach Career Development research represents 23.7% of articles that were coded by coaching focus category 1998-2001 (Gilbert and Trudel, 2004).

[72] Lyle (2008) distinguishes three principal contexts in which sport coaching can take place: recreational/community; club/performance; excellence.

> important element of provision. However, sports coaching is a contested term in the sense that there are quite distinct forms of coaching that can be associated with sport participation domains and contexts (Lyle, 2008, p.215)

Critically, Lyle (2008) indicates support for the necessity of both domain-specificity and context-specificity in sport coaching. Lyle (2008, p.222) uses examples from each end of the 'participation continuum' to emphasise the need for this:

> Sports coaching education/certification has traditionally neglected the pedagogical delivery skills, and this may render such coaches less suitable for the initiation-level demands in school-based interventions…As a picture gradually emerges of coaching roles with specialised functions and expertise being associated with specific domains, there is also potential for the 'wrong' forms of coaching to be adopted. This is generally thought to describe the deployment of (usually) higher level sports-specific coaches whose emphasis on technical development and preparation for competition is assumed to be less suitable for the less committed beginner, for whom sport is often a means to achieving other benefits (Lyle, 2008, p.222).

Unfortunately policy formation influencing the practice of sports coaching can be seen to respond in line with the drive for evidence-based policy-making in the wider context of sport policy without consideration that there is a marked difference between the theoretical logic of evidence-based policy making and what happens in reality. This is what Coalter (2007, p.1) would highlight as one of the methodological weaknesses associated with research evidence informing policy and practice, and that this "reflects the *mythopoeic status* of sport and the assumption of inevitably positive outcomes, with little need for monitoring and evaluation [in a sports coaching context] – sport works". This is evident in 'The UK Coaching Framework: A 3-7-11 Action Plan' in which sports coaching levels have become aligned with LTAD [Long Term Athlete Development] stages, and indeed the language of Balyi's work now dominates such that coaching development in now termed 'Long Term Coaching Development' [LTCD][73]. Although there are those that support the premise of LTAD being used as a framework for coach education (Van Neutegem, 2006; Way and

[73] See Stafford and Balyi (2005) '*Coaching for long term athlete development: improving participation and performance in sport'.*

O'Leary, 2006) Lyle (2008) critiques the policy on the basis that the alignment created between LTAD stages and levels of coaching are achieved through the coach's role function and not the coaching domain. Indeed, Trudel (2006) disagrees with LTADs use for coaches' development as LTAD is based on physiological growth and development theories of adolescents (the 'what' and 'when' of coaching) whereas coach education should be based on adult learning theories (the 'how' to coach). There are now calls for research into the training and development of coaches (Lyle, 2007; Nash and Collins, 2006) with the next step looking at it from a lifelong learner perspective (Côté, 2006; Gilbert, Côté and Mallett, 2006).

4.6 *Influence* of Sports Coaching Research

Having demonstrated that that the major policy shaping the professionalisation of the sport coaching profession – 'The UK Coaching Framework: A 3-7-11 Action Plan' – is based on an adherence to the governments propensity for evidence-based policy formation and a problematic research base, it is necessary to critique the practice of sport coaching research in order to be able to argue for a reconceptualisation of the 'theme field'.

Coaching research has had very limited influence on the way that coaches are trained or the content of policies and large-scale programmes (Abraham and Collins, 1998; Lyle, 2002) signifying a theory-practice gap[74]. Trudel and Gilbert (2006) suggest that producers of coaching research typically publish their results in scientific journals written for other scientists with little or no consideration on applying the findings to coach education, the practice of coaching, or coaching practitioners. The tension between practitioners and researchers is not unique to the 'theme field' of sports coaching[75], and can be attributed to different goals between different stakeholders in the research process: "the professional wants

[74] Murray et al. (2007) articulate that in modern opinion, 'theory' tends to be distinguished from 'practice' in the way that 'thinking' is separate from 'doing' (the *vita contemplativa* from the *vita activa*). Murray et al. (2007) posit that this is a false and dangerous binary. See Foucault (1977) for an insightful discussion on how theory and practice are related.
[75] For example this tension is also mirrored in education (Bates, 2002b).

new solutions to operational problems while the researcher seeks new knowledge" (Bates, 2002b, p.404). This propensity to align the research to an academic audience might also lead to the researchers asking the 'wrong' types of research questions[76]:

> Are the research questions driven by basic research agendas, which may or may not have application for coaching, or by practical issues in coach training and coaching? This raises two issues for immediate consideration: what are the main research questions that have been posed in coaching research, and who are the main authors of this research? (Trudel and Gilbert, 2006, p.524).

In answer to the questions posed, 80% of the main research questions investigated in coaching research have been oriented towards a quantitative epistemology. However, it must be highlighted that the adoption of a qualitative research methodology is on the steady increase (from 1970-77 (0%) to 1998-2001 (28.2%)) (Gilbert and Trudel, 2004a). Extrapolating from Gilbert and Trudel's (2004a) data to present day[77], a conservative estimate of 45% of coaching research adopting a qualitative approach could be postulated. Within the confines of methodological orientation, it is not surprising to see that questionnaires were by far the most common method of data collection (69%), however recent increases in qualitative methodology have resulted in a concomitant increase in the use of interviews and a relative decline in questionnaire use (Gilbert and Trudel, 2004a). Indeed, not only is there an increase in the use of interviews as the method of data collection (See Jones et al., 2004), it must be emphasised that contemporary coaching research can be seen to embrace an eclectic range of qualitative methods such as autoethnography (See Haleem et al., 2004; Jones, 2006; Purdy et al., 2008), narratives (See Denison, 2007; Tsang, 2000), poetic representations (See Sparkes et al., 2003) and fictional dialogue (See Jones, 2007). Methodological concerns can also be expressed regarding the reliance on a single method of data collection (only 14.4% of articles combined two or more methods in the same study), the

[76] See Abraham and Collins (1998) '*Examining and extending research in coach development*'.
[77] From 1994-1997 qualitative methodology increased 9.1% and from 1998-2001 7.7%. Using the average rise of 8.4% for each of these time periods, and estimate of 45% is reached for the present day.

focus on one type of research participant – the head coach[78] – leading to a one-dimensional portrait of coaching, a scarcity of portraits of the coaching process from a female[79] or other so-called 'minority' groups[80], a predominance of team sports as the medium for study[81], and an over emphasis on school (college/university) based sport coaching. It is these methodological concerns that a reconceptualised field of sports coaching must address.

Interestingly, in relation to Trudel and Gilbert's (2006) second question – who are the main authors of this research? – an issue that was highlighted from Gilbert and Trudel's (2004a) analysis is that there is a wide range of contributors to coaching research, and between 1970 and 2001 only six authors had contributed at least ten or more journal publications: Pastore (n = 21); Chelladurai (n = 13); Salmela (n = 13); Trudel (n = 13); Gould (n = 12), Solomon (n = 10). In addition to this, seventeen authors have all authored or co-authored at least six articles in the database. These seventeen scholars frequently collaborate on research publications; however in Gilbert and Trudel's (2004a) analysis these seventeen authors collectively represent only 2% of the published articles. This leads to the issue that few scholars have had a programmatic research line in coaching (Kahan, 1999) which has left the vast majority of sport coaching research at the formative stage and thus limiting its development and application as a field of research (Trudel and Gilbert, 2006). The affect of this on an academic's career progression is that:

> Because coaching science is at the stage of a topic (theme field) and not a theory field, it is not likely that university departments will hire coaching science specialists in the theory fields…If by chance, those who are hired have interests in investigating a theme field such as coaching science, then research on coaching science will continue to be generated (Gilbert and Trudel, 2004a, p.395).

[78] Other stakeholders – the assistant coach, game official, administrators, and parents – also exert an influence on the coaching process.
[79] Fewer than 5% of the coaching research articles were devoted exclusively to female coaches (Gilbert and Trudel, 2004).
[80] Contemporary research is starting to address scarcity in particular 'minority' groups. See Anderson (2007) '*Coaching identity and social exclusion*' for an insightful discussion on sport and a coach's role in relation to misogyny, homophobia, ableism, racism and violence.
[81] Seven of the top ten sports are team sports with basketball alone present in one third of the studies. Tennis, track and field, swimming and diving are the individual-type sports in the top ten (Gilbert and Trudel, 2004).

Even within the confinement of this context, Trudel (2006) identifies a range of academics that have managed to undertake and disseminate research in the theme field of sport coaching research. The work of Gould and his colleagues [Diffenbach; Moffett; Guinan; Greenleaf; Chung] in the United States and also the work of Salmela and colleagues in Canada are similarly defined as instrumental in line with Gilbert and Trudel's (2004a) analysis, however importantly other academics are creating a programmatic research line in sport coaching and therefore facilitating it's development as a field of research on the journey to establishing a theory field:

> While in Canada we must consider the work of…Côté and colleagues [Baker; Abernathy; Baria; Russell; Sedgwick; Dowd]. In England we have to mention Lyle, Jones and colleagues [Armour; Potrac], as well as Jowett and colleagues [Cockerill]. Finally, in France, the work of Arripe-Longueville and colleagues [Fournier], and the study of Saury and Durand are often referenced. A search in any sport research database using the names of these authors will provide reading for hours (Trudel, 2006, p.127).

Essentially it is these scholars – 'the elders' (Mitchell, 1992) or 'the gatekeepers of Good Science'' (Murray et al., 2007) – that are controlling the "invisible networks of prestige" (Mitchell, 1992, p.426) determining what research is accepted for publication in professional journals and ultimately prescribing what is the knowledge base for the theory field of sport coaching. In addition to this Trudel and Gilbert (2006, p.525) allude to the focus of 'the elders' being narrowly defined by one or two categories within the coaching database:

> Thus although scholars from different fields have contributed to coaching research, if there is no effort made to work together and combine the different perspectives we will lose an opportunity to create a holistic understanding of the coaching process, and a better understanding of its complexity[82].

[82] See Jones et al. (2002) '*Understanding the coaching process: a framework for social analysis*'.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter has explicated the central space that sport inhabits in contemporary society. Not only is sport valued intrinsically for its own sake in developing skills, self-esteem, enjoyment, tolerance, discipline and fun for its participants, sport is seen as an important vehicle by nation states and global associations to contribute to a corporate, economic strategy and external, wider social roles. The marginalised utopian ideology that sport is not a part of politics or has nothing to do with politics – the myth of autonomy (Maguire et al., 2002) – is critiqued from the position that political ideology can be seen to manifest in public policy through sport. The process of 'joined up government' (Houlihan and White, 2002) evident with the Labour government has led to embracing the assumption that sport possesses the potential to contribute to the public policy drive of a social inclusion agenda. The wider role for sport nationally includes social and economic regeneration, crime reduction, health improvement and educational achievement, and additionally gender and ethnicity equality and peace on a global scale, although Coalter (2007) questions whether there is robust research evidence on which to base these policies.

Even with the debate surrounding the robustness of the evidence-based sports policy universe, there is no question that sport is *valued* for both intrinsic and extrinsic reasons and more and more children are participating in organised sport around the world (De Knopp et al., 1996). With more sport participants and a wider social role for sport, then more emphasis needs to be placed on the environment in which this participation takes place, and indeed "one major factor that influences all performers [at all levels] throughout their sporting careers is the quality and appropriateness of the coaching environment" (Martindale et al., 2005, p.353). There has been a considerable increase in sports coaching as an academic endeavour at foundation degree, undergraduate and postgraduate level that has mirrored the rise in government policy. In order to bridge the theory-practice gap for coaching practitioners, stakeholders in the coaching process (athletes, parents, officials etc.) and policy makers, there is need for the reconceptualisation of the 'theme field' of sports coaching research to establish

itself as a programmatic research line that is sympathetic to the wider externalities presented by sport. This would require overcoming the invisible networks of prestige afforded to the 'elders' or 'gatekeepers' of sports coaching research and also prevail over the methodological *crisis* that posits a one-dimensional portrait of sports coaching (Gilbert and Trudel, 2004a). The result would be research that not only reflects the current sports coaching moment but also meets the desire to create a holistic understanding of the sports coaching process, and a fuller understanding of its complexity (Jones et al., 2002; Trudel and Gilbert, 2006).

CHAPTER 5: An Evolving Criticality in Sports Coaching Research

> At this moment in history, a concatenation of forces led by the conservative cultural logics of neo-liberalism seeks to shape a definition of inquiry that precludes multiple paradigms, epistemologies, and theoretical perspectives from the policy arena (Lincoln, 2005, p.179).

> This is not meant to be a defensive attack on science *qua* science, merely an observation or interpretations as to why particular ways of knowing have become privileged over others within particular social and historical contexts. Whether we choose to realize it or not, it is the context in which [sports coaching] has been, and is being, disciplined and institutionalized that has had the most profound impact on the nature of the field. As Kuhn (1970) suggested, particular regimes of power are underpinned by specific regimes of truth and visa versa. The rational productivity of liberal capitalist society finds its epistemic corroboration in the positivist objectivism that underpins the scientific method, as conventionally understood (Andrews, 2008, p.48).

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, it was postulated from Gilbert and Trudel's (2004a) data that 45% of contemporary sports coaching research now adopts a qualitative approach, indicating an increase in the acceptability of more divergent perspectives. The danger is that these divergent perspectives are seen much more as part of the so-called 'paradigm wars' (Hinings and Greenwood, 2002) than as raising questions with which the theme field of sports coaching has to be concerned. This chapter explicates the inconvenient truth that is at the core of the *crisis* facing the theme field of sports coaching. Namely, "the instantiation of an epistemological hierarchy that privileges positivist over postpositivist, quantitative over qualitative, and predictive over interpretive ways of knowing" (Andrews, 2008, p.45). Importantly in the field of sports coaching, the majority of research privileges scientifically based research (SBR) or as it alternatively referred to, evidence-based research (EBR). The field of sports coaching therefore needs to be concerned with, and address how this has "turn[ed] social enquiry into the handmaiden of a technocratic, globalizing managerialism"

(Denzin et al., 2006, p.772), reflecting an acquiescence to the neoliberal regime and a necessity to pursue quantitative methodologies[83]. It should be reiterated that the "invisible networks of prestige" (Mitchell, 1992, p.426) that define and shape the knowledge base for the theme field of sport coaching is not necessarily the output of the most robust research programmes, as it is those that are best located, resourced and publicised that are taken to be the most robust (Clegg, 2002). As it is the scholars – the 'elders' (Mitchell, 1992) – that control these invisible networks that are then consecrated by their adoption in the *evidence*-based based sports policy universe by the most powerful patrons, the resultant power allows them to "play the incommensurability card by constituting those who do not agree with their 'paradigm' as, at best, marginal – not people like us – or, at worst, belonging to a dangerously separate or lunatic fringe" (Clegg, 2002, p.435).

One positive outcome of the 'paradigm wars' is that there is no longer any pretence to epistemological orthodoxy (Clegg, 2002), and provides the opportunity for the theme field of sports coaching to move towards a field of study that is interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary and counterdisciplinary[84] in nature (Kincheloe and Maclaren, 2005). The end result is an evolving criticality in the theme field of sports coaching that is devoid of discrete schools of analysis – what Denzin and Lincoln (2000) have referred to as bricolage. Following the notion that sports coaching scholarship can be located "in a transformative praxis that leads to the alleviation of suffering and the overcoming of oppression" (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005, p.321), this chapter presents the notion of a *sports coaching without guarantees*, and unpicks what it means to adopt a physical cultural sensibility and the impact this has on the ontological complexity, epistemological position, axiological praxis, methodological toolbox, and representational considerations for scholarly activity in a

[83] 80% of main research questions in sports coaching are oriented towards a quantitative methodology (Gilbert and Trudel, 2004a).

[84] As an interdisciplinary project, the field of study draws upon a number of disciplines and is multiperspectival in nature. As a transdisciplinary project, it has its own integrity as defined by the practices, methods, and work developing in its tradition. As a counterdisciplinary project, assimilation into standard academic disciplines is refused, and there is openness to a variety of methods and theoretical positions whilst assuming a critical-oppositional stance to the current organisation of the field.

reconceptualised theme field of sports coaching. Preceding this discussion however, there is a need to elaborate on the issues pertaining to adoption of the evidence-based movement (EBM) in the field of sports coaching research.

5.2 Evidence-Based Sports Coaching (EBSC)

The previous chapter alluded to the inexorable link between 'evidence' and policy making in the 'sports policy universe' and also the translation of this into the field of sports coaching research. Morse (2006, p.79) describes the 'politics of evidence' as "the politics of ignorance, stigma, and conflicting agendas". The 'politics of evidence' extends to academic and governmental levels and acts as an impediment to research in the social sciences, thus constricting qualitative inquiry (Morse, 2006). Invoking and paraphrasing Morse (2006), this oppressive movement is impeding how, when, and to whom qualitative enquiry is taught, contracted, funded, conducted, published, read, and implemented.

The extent of the evangelical status of 'evidence' in the field of sports coaching research – termed evidence-based sports coaching (EBSC) – is emphasised by the opening line on Sports coach UK (2008, p.1 – emphasis added) research section: "Research provides the underpinning *evidence* for decision making, policy and practice for coaching, coach development and education". This positioning manifests in the 'gold standard' for [sports coaching] research being ascribed to research that is 'scientific' or 'evidence' based (St. Pierre and Roulston, 2006). Morse (2006, p.79) succinctly defines evidence as "something that is concrete and indisputable". Developing on from this, Murray et al. (2008) contextualise 'evidence' as repeatable, independently verifiable, and measured according to agreed standards – a 'common sense view' – that holds true not just in the sciences but also in the 'real' world. Evidence in this context results in a "dangerously naïve commonsense view on truth" (Murray et al., 2007, p.273) where 'seeing is believing'. Murray et al. (2008, p.273) argue that "this view betrays an almost unshakeable faith in the human capacity for unbiased or objective observation and analysis. Ultimately, this means that science becomes supplanted by ideology, and scientific inquiry becomes a 'methodological

fundamentalism' (House, 2006)[85]" shaped by the conservative cultural logics of neo-liberalism (Lincoln, 2005).

Paradoxically, philosophers and critical theorists would argue that 'seeing' and 'believing' make strange allies. Indeed, Murray et al. (2008) argue that to see is, in some sense, to interpret what is seen. These interpretations are not always conscious, but will determine how something will appear to us as either true or false. Consideration therefore must be given to "the ways in which evidence is manipulated and contextualised under the aegis of efficiency, in the name of political expediency or in the name of scientific progress, and sometimes all three at once" (Murray et al., 2008, p.274). This manipulation of evidence raises questions about the value-free objectivity that proponents of EBSC so fervently seek:

> 'Evidence', we learn, is far from neutral; 'truth' and 'evidence' are always overdetermined by the social, historical and political contexts that lend them their currency and power. These inform our methodologies, and we know that these methodologies, in turn, directly and indirectly shape the object of inquiry (Murray et al., 2007, p.515).

Murray et al. (2007) intimate that in the extreme 'evidence' becomes 'fixed', and is made to fit procrustean policies. An example of this, that highlights that 'evidence' is not neutral, is how the Bush administration sold the unilateral intervention and occupation of Iraq to the world by citing 'evidence' that *appeared* to be 'objective', 'reliable' and 'generalisable': "Under the Bush regime, a fact or piece of evidence is true if it meets three criteria: (a) it has the appearance of being factual; (b) it is patriotic; and (c) it supports a political action that advances the White House's far-right neoconservative agenda" (Denzin et al., 2006, p.775). Evidence that contradicts the political agenda is deemed to be flawed and/or biased. In the field of sports coaching, researchers, coaching practitioners, and stakeholders that blindly adopt evidence-based practices are acting in bad faith (Murray et al., 2007). Importantly, "they fail to

[85] Methodological fundamentalists are motivated by similar concerns to those of religious fundamentalists (House, 2006). Denzin et al. (2006) note that this observation is particularly striking given the extent to which the Bush administration has aligned itself with the Christian right (for example on issues related to abstinence education, same-sex marriage, stem-cell research). See Goldberg (2006) and Kaplan (2004) for more on this partnership.

think or to act with intellectual integrity; they forsake scientific rigour and honest inquiry for the simple gratifications of ideology, greed, routinisation and efficiency" (Murray et al., 2007, p.512).

Using the Socratic dictum concerning wisdom[86], when the 'scientist' knows that he or she has arrived at this rational standoff, Murray et al. (2007, p.513) use this moment, and the concomitant rupture in ones epistemological worldview, to 'open the door' to another way of thinking or acting: "Rather than continuing down the road to nowhere, wisdom calls for detours, new and different paths, a new vista on the same problem, a working – and thinking – through the *aporia*"[87]. There is a need for cross-pollination between academic disciplines and between theory and practice, and as real innovation often comes from the margins or boundaries of a discipline, sometimes a relative 'outsider' is best positioned to offer a new 'lens', resulting in new terms of understanding or a new methodological approach:

> …the outsider is not limited by the theoretico-practical terms that govern the insider's regime of knowledge; the outsider brings a different lexicon, novel explanatory terms and a fresh *modus operandi*. The outsider puts her or his theory into practice. As Deleuze famously remarks, here theory 'is exactly like a box of tools'; the outsider (whom he [Deleuze] also calls the 'nomad') sets to work to build something new, trespassing upon our familiar terrain and transgressing our traditional topologies (Murray et al., 2007, p.513).

The outsider can be perceived as a threatening interloper, leading the critical examination of the evidence-based movement to be a target of a strong, disparaging reaction (Murray et al., 2007). However, there are those that subscribe to the view that evidence-based practices do not *increase* objectivity but *obscures* the subjective elements that are central to all forms of human inquiry (Goldenberg, 2006). Ideally, "Critical, interpretive qualitative research creates the power for positive, ethical, communitarian change, and the new practitioners entering this field deeply desire to use the power of the university to

[86] "I am wise when I can honestly say: 'I know that I know nothing!'" (Murray et al., 2007, p.513).
[87] The point of 'no exit'.

make such a change" (Denzin et al., 2006, p.779). Morse (2006, p.90) emphasises the challenge this poses to qualitative researchers:

> As researchers, we are tired of conducting underfunded research that seemingly goes nowhere. Yet, forcing ourselves into a quantitative system does not appear to be the answer. Although we know that our research is significant and addresses problems that may otherwise be declared not researchable, our seemingly insurmountable problem is to convince those who control research funding, curricula, and the publication of texts and mainstream journals that our work is significant.

Thus, within the field of sports coaching, there is a need to ensure that 'nomadic' researchers within academic institutions are empowered to challenge the 'elders' or 'gatekeepers' that remain faithful largely to EBSC research. The challenge is also to ensure that this empowerment takes place in tandem with a change in the 'political economy of evidence' (Larner, 2004). The 'political economy of evidence' explicates that it "is not a question of evidence *or* no evidence, but who controls the definition of evidence and which kind is acceptable to whom" (Larner, 2004, p.20). It needs to be emphasised that it is qualitative researchers that address the confusing and chaotic – but still important – problems that are too difficult to tackle quantitatively (Morse, 2006). It is also the qualitative researchers that "sit on the fringes of research, but remember that it is on the fringes where the greatest advances are often made" (Morse, 2006, p.90).

5.3 Sports [Coaching] Without Guarantees

The first decade of the 21st Century has witnessed an extension to an ever-evolving criticality by the "post-discourses" (e.g. postmodern, critical feminism, poststructuralism) resulting in a reconceptualised critical theory that questions the assumption that Western societies such as the nations of the European Union and the United States are unproblematically democratic and free (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005). In this context, critical researchers[88] understand that a greater emphasis is placed on social and historical forces than previously believed

[88] Contemporary critical researchers are influenced by an eclectic range of critical traditions that have drawn inspiration from, amonst others: Marx; Kant; Hegel; Weber; the Frankfurt School theorists; Foucault; Habermas; Derrida; Freire; Irigaray; Kristeva; Cixous; Bakhtin; Vygotsky (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005).

(Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005) and that new ways of researching and analysing the construction of individuals is needed (Quail et al., 2004; Skalli, 2004; Wesson and Weaver, 2001).

Cultural studies has become a forceful presence over the past decade, with its influence transcending national and disciplinary boundaries (Andrews, 2002). With the inexorable rise in the number of people professing to *do* cultural studies of sport, the sociology of sport's engagement with cultural studies has never been more pronounced than it is today (Andrews, 2002). Cultural studies can loosely be defined as a form of *critical* cultural analysis (Andrews, 2002), with the decisive juncture in it's genealogy attributed to the output and intellectual culture developed in the Birmingham School between 1964 and 1979[89] (Rojek and Turner, 2000).

At this current moment, Grossberg (2006) is motivated by the belief that – despite, if not because of, the highly professionalised, capitalised and formalised [US] university system – intellectual work matters and is a vital component of the struggle to change the world and make it more humane. Cultural studies, "as a particular project, a particular sort of intellectual practice, has something valuable to contribute. Cultural studies also matters!" (Grossberg, 2006, p.2). The geo-political development of cultural studies has not followed a uniform pattern, therefore it is peculiarly difficult to characterise the main features of contemporary cultural studies:

> For example, in the USA the main focus is on media, communications, technoculture and multiculturalism. In Canada, an interest in peripheral cultures and cultural ambiguity is more pronounced together with an older tradition in media studies associated with the work of Harold Innis and Marshall McLuhan and the studies in 'excremental culture' pursued by Kroker. In Australia the questions of colonialism, post-colonialism, dependency, feminism, aboriginality, multi-culturalism and cultural policy have been at the forefront (Rojek and Turner, 2000, p.630).

However, located at the definitional core of the cultural studies project is a "radical contextualism" (Grossberg, 1997a, p.7):

[89] See DuGay et al. (1997) and Barker (2000).

> Cultural studies is a project not only to construct a political history of the present, but to do so in a particular way, a radically contextualist way, in order to avoid reproducing the very sorts of universalisms (and essentialisms) that all too often characterize the dominant practices of knowledge production, and that have contributed (perhaps unintentionally) to making the very relations of domination, inequality and suffering that cultural studies desires to change. Cultural studies seeks to embrace complexity and contingency, and to avoid the many faces and forms of reductionism (Grossberg, 2006, p.2).

Importantly, Grossberg (1997a, pp.7-8) argues that for cultural studies "context is everything and everything is context" and that cultural studies is best seen "as a contextual theory of contexts as the lived milieux of power". Located at the conceptual core of Grossberg's (1997a) appreciation of cultural studies is Stuart Hall's (1996) "Marxism without guarantees" (Andrews, 2002), and it is the importance placed by Hall on historical context or moment (or conjuncture) that Andrews (2002, p.112) contends provides the ontological, theoretical, and methodological basis of cultural studies.

Hall (1981, p.233) identified the cultural realm as a "sort of constant battlefield" between the constraining influence of the social structure and the creative impulses of human agents. As a result, Hall (1996) presents a reconceptualisation of the concept of 'determinancy' that circumvented both the economically deterministic perils of the so-called vulgar Marxism[90] and the romanticism of cultural humanism[91] (Andrews, 2002):

> …the economic aspect of capitalist production processes has real limiting and constraining effects (i.e. determinancy), for the categories in which the circuits of production are *thought*, ideologically, and visa versa. The economic provides the repertoire of categories which will be used, in thought. What the economic cannot do is (a) to provide the *contents* of the particular thoughts of particular social classes or groups at any specific time; or (b) to fix or guarantee for all time which ideas will be made use of by which classes. The determinancy of the economic for the

[90] Marxism: asserted a *necessary correspondence* between the various elements of society and the overbearing economic realm (Andrews, 2002).

[91] Humanism: asserted a *necessarily no correspondence* between the various elements of society, thus providing the human agent and cultural practices with a romanticised level of autonomy (Andrews, 2002).

> ideological can, therefore, be only in terms of the former setting the limits for defining the terrain of operations, establishing the 'raw materials', of thought. Material circumstances are the net of constraints, the 'conditions of existence' for practical thought and calculation about society (Hall, 1996, p.44).

Within Hall's "Marxism without guarantees", Hall (1995) does not accept the simple inversion – "the usual unstoppable philosophical slide" (Hall, 1995, p.94) – from "necessary correspondence" to "necessarily no correspondence" between one level of social formation and another, and instead presents the different notion that there is *no necessary correspondence*:

> This means that there is no law which guarantees that the ideology of a class is already and unequivocally given in or corresponds to the position which that class holds in the economic relations of capitalist production. The claim of "no guarantee" – which breaks with teleology – also implies that there is no necessary *non-correspondence*. That is, there is no guarantee that, under all circumstances, ideology and class can never be articulated together in any way or produce a social force capable for a time of self-conscious "unity in action", in a class struggle (Hall, 1985, pp.94-95).

Andrews (2002) indicates that the no necessary *non-correspondence* is evident between not only one level of social formation and another, but also between the social structure and the human agent, or between a cultural practice such as sport and the various forces acting within a social structure.

The alternative structure that challenges the "inevitable march of events spinning out their inevitable consequences" (Grossberg, 1992, p.53) would have to be anti-essentialist, starting with the "principle that nothing is guaranteed, that no correspondences are necessary, that no identity is intrinsic" (Grossberg, 1992, p.53). Indeed, "it establishes the *open horizon* of Marxist theorising – determinancy without guaranteed closures. The paradigm of perfectly closed, perfectly predictable, systems of thought is religion or astrology, not science" (Hall, 1996, p.45). To operate within a contextual cultural studies strategy means recognising that cultural forms (practices [such as sport and sport coaching], discourses, and subjectivities etc.) "can only be understood by the way in which

they are *articulated* [92] into a particular set of complex social, economic, political, and technological relationships that comprise the social context" (Silk and Andrews, in press, p.6). It should be remembered that:

> Although the connections or identities are never intrinsic or guaranteed, they are always – at least temporarily – real and effective. There are no necessary correspondences in history, but history is always the production of such connections or correspondences (Grossberg, 1992, p.53).

Therefore, instead of engaging sport as a foundational, originary, or essential category[93] there is a need for an evolution of an understanding of sport as a fluid, dynamic category whose definition and composition is contextually grounded and utilises sensitive research practice (Andrews, 2002):

> Sport has meant, and continues to mean, different things in different cultural and temporal contexts. The structure and influence of sport in any given conjuncture is a product of intersecting, multidirectional lines of articulation between the forces and practices that compose the social context. The very uniqueness of the historical moment, or conjuncture, means there is a condition of no necessary correspondence, or indeed noncorrespondence, between sport and particular forces (i.e., the economic): Forces do not determine the *given ness* of sporting practices, their determinacy just cannot be guaranteed in advance. So, sport-oriented research demands a truly contextual sensibility premised on, and seeking to excavate and theorize, the contingent relations, structure, and effects that link sport forms with prevailing determinate forces: In effect, what I am suggesting is the mobilization of a *sport without guarantees* (Andrews, 2002, p.116).

In order to ensure that *sport without guarantees* and contemporaneously *sports coaching without guarantees* is capable of demonstrating a truly contextual sensibility, then the complex, multi-layered site of sport – replete with numerous overlapping systems and discourses (economic, political, technological, aesthetic, demographic, regulatory, spatial) – needs to reflect societies fundamental divisions along hierarchically ordered lines of division (class, ethnic, gender, ability, generational, national, racial and/or sexual norms). In order to attempt to achieve this, the issues of "hyperfragmentation" and

[92] For an insightful discussion on articulation and culture in a cultural studies context see Grossberg (1992) chapter 1 '*Articulation and culture*'.
[93] What Derrida (1978, p.146) termed "transcendental signified".

"hyperspecialization" (Andrews, 2008, p.46) among those interested in the socio-historic analysis of physical activity, need to be overcome. The answer is interdisciplinarity and a need for intellectual integration. Thus, drawing on the work of Andrews (2008) and reworking Gill (2007, p.275), the theme field of sports coaching:

> …clearly is *multi*-disciplinary, drawing from many (multiple disciplinary areas (e.g., biology, psychology, sociology), and including multiple subdisciplinary areas (e.g., biomechanics, sport history, exercise physiology). Isolated multiple subdisciplines do not make for an integrated academic area, and a collection of *cross*-disciplinary areas that simply live together does not constitute an integrated…discipline. Inter-disciplinary implies actual connections among subareas, and an interdisciplinary [field of sports coaching] that integrates subdisciplinary knowledge is essential.

Intellectual integration – around the central thematic of sports coaching, of areas of study with common epistemological and ontological bases – is, "therefore, a necessary first step to creating a more-comprehensive and integrative [sports coaching], one that does not hide behind the inadequacies and derelictions of its current iteration" (Andrews, 2008, p.47).

5.4 A *Physical* Cultural Studies (PCS) Sensibility

It was posited earlier in the chapter that there has been an inexorable rise in the number of people professing to *do* cultural studies of sport, and as a result the sociology of sport's engagement with cultural studies has never been more pronounced than it is today (Andrews, 2002). It is important to highlight that the adoption of *sport* as the default descriptor during the process of the subdisciplinisation of physical education, and it's continued use, have proved to be severely limiting:

> *Sport* is a vague and imprecise noun that fails to capture the empirical breadth of the work carried out within the sociology of sport. In what the poststructuralists among us would refer to as a *sea of empty signifiers*, *sport* is arguably one of the most-highly contested and least useful nouns with which to frame an area of study…If *culture*, according to Raymond

> Williams (1981), is one of the most complex words in the English language, then *sport* cannot be far behind, and the notion of *sport culture* is an almost ironic statement of ambiguity (Andrews, 2008, p.50).

Andrews (2008) argues that sport has to be considered one, of many, constituent elements within the broader domain of physical culture. The broader domain of physical culture encompasses various dimensions of physicality – including, but not restricted to sport, exercise, fitness, dance, wellness, health, and movement practices – leading to the tacit physical culturalisation of the sociology of sport (Silk and Andrews, in press). Ultimately, rather than an "expressive totality" (Clarke, 1991, p.17) coalescing around sport, the sociology of sport is unified by a commitment toward understanding the various expressions or iterations of the *physical* (Andrews, 2008). It is for this reason that the nomenclature of Physical Cultural Studies (PCS) is mobilised in order to encompass the breadth and depth of a comprehensive and integrative field of sports coaching research. Despite the fact that PCS is a field[94] in its infancy, quoting the working, fluid, definitional *statement* developed by Andrews (2008, pp.54-55) in its entirety is important to reinforce the advancement from the earlier discussion on a critical cultural analysis of sport, to reflect the migration of *sport* to *physical culture* and to illuminate the PCS sensibility guiding this research enquiry:

> PCS advances the critical and theoretical analysis of physical culture, in all its myriad forms. These include sport, exercise, health, dance, and movement related practices, which PCS research locates and analyzes within the broader social, political, economic, and technological contexts in which they are situated. More specifically, PCS is dedicated to the contextually based understanding of the corporeal practices, discourses, and subjectivities through which active bodies become organized, represented, and experienced in relation to the operations of social power. PCS thus identifies the role played by physical culture in reproducing, and sometimes challenging, particular class, ethnic, gender, ability, generational, national, racial, and/or sexual norms and differences. Through the development and strategic dissemination of potentially empowering forms of knowledge and understanding, PCS seeks to illuminate, and intervene into, sites of physical cultural injustice and inequity. Furthermore, since physical culture is both manifest and experienced in different forms, PCS adopts a multi-method approach toward engaging the empirical (including ethnography and autoethnography, participant observation, discourse and media analysis,

[94] Silk and Andrews (2007) indicate that they are not sure if PCS deserves the moniker of 'field'.

and contextual analysis). PCS advances an equally fluid theoretical vocabulary, utilizing concepts and theories from a variety of disciplines (including cultural studies, economics, history, media studies, philosophy, sociology, and urban studies) in engaging and interpreting the particular aspect of physical culture.

5.5 The Ontological, Epistemological, and Axiological Praxis of Physical Cultural Studies.

This section of the chapter will offer a directional purview of the ontological complexity, and the epistemological and methodological boundaries of PCS. As outlined previously, to practice PCS means recognising that physical cultural forms can only be understood by the way in which they are *articulated* into a particular set of complex social, economic, political, and technological relationships that comprise the social context (Silk and Andrews, in press). In using this theory/method, PCS aims to provide a context within which an identified physical "event" – that represents, almost in an abstract sense, a potential important focus of critical enquiry – becomes understandable. In reality, articulation involves "starting with the particular, the detail, the scrap of ordinary or banal existence, and then working to unpack the density of relations and of intersecting social domains that inform it" (Frow and Morris, 2000, p.354) – a practice that involves what Fine (1994) has termed 'working the hyphen'.

Through practising PCS in this time of global uncertainty – the 'pernicious present' (Silk and Andrews, in press) – the opportunity exists to challenge the neoconservative myths, performances, narratives, stories, and *laws* put in place to destroy freedom and democracy (Denzin et al., 2006; Giroux, 2004b; Lakoff, 2006). Government agencies around the world are attempting to regulate academic inquiry by defining what counts as 'good' science[95] (Denzin et al., 2006), resulting in a "methodological fundamentalism" that favours empirical enquiry in which "only randomized experiments produce *truth*" (House, 2006, pp.100-101 – emphasis added). Through applying a PCS sensibility to sports coaching research, what emerges is a need for a "methodology of the heart, a

[95] See Torrance (2006) for an insightful discussion on research quality and research governance in the UK.

prophetic, feminist postpragmatism that embraces an ethics of truth grounded in love, care, hope and forgiveness" (Denzin et al., 2006, p.770).

5.5.1 (Double) Ontological Complexity of Physical Cultural Studies

Denzin and Lincoln (2000) explicated the concept of 'bricolage' in relation to qualitative research. The term is derived from Claude Levi-Strauss' (1966) discussion of it in *The Savage Mind* who deployed the French word *bricoleur*, which describes a handyman or handywoman who makes use of the tools available to complete a task (Harper, 1987). As an extension to the notion of evolving criticality in qualitative research, Kincheloe (2001, p.680) expresses that "no concept better captures the possibility of the future of qualitative research" and signifies the interdisciplinarity and intellectual integration necessary in *sport coaching without guarantees*. In addition to this, *bricoleurs* also contribute to the social transformation necessary for those practising PCS through seeking a better understanding of both the worldviews of diverse peoples and the forces of domination affecting individuals (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005). Despite the denigration of bricolage by those in the academic community that see interdisciplinarity by nature as superficial, madness, knowing nothing well and misguided (Friedman, 1998; McLeod, 2000; Palmer, 1996), bricolage holds profound implications for critical research through the notion of a critical ontology (Kincheloe, 2003):

> Bricoleurs maintain that this object of enquiry [the event] is ontologically complex in that it can't be described as an encapsulated entity. In this more open view, the object of inquiry is always part of many contexts and processes; it is culturally inscribed and historically situated. The complex view of the object of inquiry accounts for the historical efforts to interpret its meanings in the world and how such efforts continue to define its social, cultural, political, psychological, and educational effects (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005, p. 319).

Bricoleurs attempt to understand the fabric or web of this complexity and the processes that shape it in as thick a way as possible (Blommaert, 1997). This ontological complexity undermines traditional notions of triangulation, because

inter-researcher reliability becomes far more difficult to achieve due to its in-process (processual) nature: "process-sensitive scholars watch the world flow by like a river in which the exact contents of the water are never the same" (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005, p.319). As all observers view the object of enquiry from their own vantage points in the web of reality, no portrait of a social phenomenon is ever exactly the same as another:

> Because all physical, social, cultural, psychological, and educational dynamics are connected in a larger fabric, researchers will produce different descriptions of an object of enquiry depending on what part of the fabric they have focused on – what part of the river they have seen. The more unaware observers are of this type of complexity, the more reductionistic the knowledge they produce about it (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005, pp.319-320).

A key ontological concern of the bricolage – and a central dynamic to be investigated in social research – is the relationship between individuals and their contexts. The multidimensionality of the relationships might be interpreted differently in terms of its meaning and effects through the multiple methods employed by bricoleurs that recognise relationships' complex ontological importance. In doing so, this alters the basic foundations of the research act and knowledge production process: "thin reductionist descriptions of isolated things-in-themselves are no longer sufficient in critical research" (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005, p.320). In essence, the bricolage is dealing with a double ontology of complexity – the complexity of objects of enquiry and their being-in-the-world, and the nature of the social construction of human subjectivity – where the process of becoming human agents is understood with a new level of sophistication (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005). This new level of sophistication afforded by a double ontology of complexity results in a multiperspectival process that moves critical researchers beyond the determinism of macrosocial structures:

> The complex feedback loop between an unstable social structure and the individual can be charted in a way that grants human beings insight into the means by which power operates and the democratic process is subverted. In this complex ontological view, bricoleurs understand that social structures do not *determine* individual subjectivity but *constrain* it in remarkably intricate ways. The bricolage is acutely interested in

> developing an employing a variety of strategies to help specify these ways subjectivity is shaped (Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005, p.320).

In practising PCS, the complexity of the feedback loop is added to by the fact that there are many ways of *being physically active* (Andrews, 2008; Silk and Andrews, in press), resulting in the empirical field of physical culture being considered an ontologically mixed entity (Frow and Morris, 2000). Although boundary marking is necessary for the purposes of empirical analysis, Andrews (2008) does provide the cautionary words that the boundaries of physical culture are fluid and dynamic and that sectoral delineation is, at best, contingent, suggestive and approximate. It was indicated earlier that sport, exercise, health, dance, and movement related practices were the myriad of forms of physical culture. Additionally, Ingham (1997) ascribes the sphere of 'recreation' to physical culture and Andrews (2008) further adds the 'pedagogic', 'work', and 'Activities of Daily Living' (ADL). Each of these spheres incorporates different motivations for, and practices of, organising and regulating human movement (Andrews, 2008); they possess a 'relative autonomy' in relation to each other (Hall, 1981). It is important to highlight that physical culture's ontological complexity:

> …is compounded by the fact that each of its various dimensions can be engaged or experienced in multiple ways. For each of them, the *active body* is something that can either be experienced (by the instrumental subject) or observed (as a representational object). Hence, PCS encompasses a breadth of empirical sites and experiences[96] (Andrews, 2008, p.55 – emphasis added).

The evolution of physical culture to include the concepts of the 'active body' and the 'pedagogic', combined with the different motivations for, and practices of, organising and regulating human movement, allows for the very essence of a reconceptualised sports coaching – with its multiple iterations of experiencing, communicating, instructing, teaching, and learning – to be captured. Through the multiplicity of sites and experiences encompassed in physical culture and the resultant ontological complexity, the mobilisation of *sports coaching without*

[96] For a list of boundary-marking studies that exemplify the diversity in PCS, see Andrews (2008).

guarantees requires advancing a methodological dynamism by researchers – with a PCS sensibility – proficient within a range of qualitative and interpretive approaches.

5.5.2 A Sacred-Moral Epistemology

A PCS sensibility assumes that "societies are fundamentally divided along hierarchically ordered lines of differentiation (i.e., those based on class, ethnic, gender, ability, generational, national, racial, and/or sexual norms), as realized through the *operations of power* and *power relations* within the social formation" (Andrews, 2008, p.57 – emphases added):

> *Power* operates at every level of human life; it is neither an abstract universal structure nor a subjective experience. It is both limiting and productive: producing differences, shaping relations, structuring identities and hierarchies, but also enabling practices and empowering social subjects…At the level of social life, power involves the historical production of "economies" – the social production, distribution, and consumption – of different forms of value (e.g., capital, money, meanings, information, representations, identities, desires, emotions, pleasures). It is the specific articulation of social subjects into these circuits which organize social possibilities and differences, that constructs the structured inequalities of social power (Grossberg, 1989, p.418).

In working to "construct a political history of the present" in a "radically contextualist way" (Grossberg, 2006, p.2), PCS contends:

> …that the various dimensions of physical culture represent moments at which such social divisions are imposed, experienced, and at times contested. PCS is thus driven by the need to understand the complexities, experiences, and injustices of the physical cultural context it confronts (particularly in relation to the relations, operations, and effects of *power*) (Andrews, 2008, p.57 – emphasis added).

As PCS is motivated by a "commitment to progressive social change" (Miller, 2001, p.1), it aims to produce the type of knowledge "through which it [PCS] would be in a position to intervene into the broader social world and *make a difference*" (Andrews, 2008, p.57). In order to challenge "the pervasive

institutional and ideological influence of neoliberalism" (Giroux, 2001, p.5), survive the "ideological crossfire" (Giroux, 2000, p.343) and make a difference, there is a need for intellectual life to dissent against the status quo; intellectuals "cannot be mistaken for an anonymous functionary or careful bureaucrat" (Said, 1994, p.13). Critical educators and researchers and [physical] cultural studies scholars have traditionally occupied separate spaces and addressed different audiences[97], although the pedagogical and political nature of their work converges around a number of points in what Giroux (2001) calls a *performative pedagogy*. A performative pedagogy locates the importance of understanding theory as the basis for "intervening into contexts and power…in order to enable people to act more strategically in ways that may change their context for the better" (Grossberg, 1996, p.143). In addition to a performative pedagogy, theorists working in both fields have argued for the primacy of the political in their attempts to produce critical public spaces (Giroux, 2001), in which "popular cultural resistance is explored as a form of political resistance" (Bailey and Hall, 1992, p.19). Grossberg (2006) calls for *political intellectuals* to move things forward and embrace other possibilities, a challenge that Scott (1999, p.223) perceives as us having:

> …to ask ourselves what the yield will be of continuing to deepen our understanding of a conceptual space whose contours we have now become so familiar with, and whose insights are rapidly on their way to becoming anew orthodoxy. We have to ask ourselves whether it might not be more useful to try to expand the conceptual boundaries themselves by altering the target of our criticism. This, it seems to me, is the challenge of our present…a new domain in which a new set of preoccupations become visible, a set of preoccupations defined not so much by the politics of epistemology as by a renewal of the theoretical question of the political.

In pushing for politically motivated research which has an explicit concern with confronting inequality, PCS offers a moral allegorical and therapeutic project with a commitment to an undertaking of social justice (Silk and Andrews, in press). This is research that 'takes sides' (Denzin, 2002) and is akin to the explicit demonstrations of partisanship that have permeated social research for at

[97] Theorists working in these fields rarely speak to each other because of the disciplinary barriers and institutional borders that atomize, insulate, and prevent collaboration across such boundaries (Giroux, 2001). This is something that the concept of bricolage addresses.

least 40 years (Amis and Silk, 2008). Such partisanship suggests an end of value-neutral research, and indeed Becker's (1967)[98] notion that there could be no objective viewpoints – and that political positions should *emerge* from findings derived from the application of robust scientific methods (i.e., Becker's (1967) "political radicalism…is a by product of a sound scientific approach" (Hammersley, 2000, p.80) – is at odds with:

> An advocacy position that *centralizes* and *internalizes* the moral, ethical, and political value of qualitative scholarship at the outset as the very raison d'être for the research itself. Thus, although we can agree with Becker that scholars will hold inherently biased positions, we clearly differ with how we arrive at this position (Amis and Silk, 2008, p.468).

Silk and Andrews (in press, p.11) call for an insurgent PCS that utilises this advocacy position as part of an ethical approach that:

> Reintegrates autonomy and the moral order, one that does not search for neutral principles to which all parties can appeal, and one that does not see people as receptacles for data, as outsiders excluded from the research process, and, that breaks down the role of researcher as expert.

In PCS, the result is research with an underlying intent based on a 'moral ethic' (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a). This [social] ethical approach is located within, what Denzin (1997; 2003) labelled, 'feminist communitarianism', and severs as an "antidote to individualist utilitarianism" and "presumes that the community is ontologically and axiologically prior to persons" (Christians, 2005, p.150). The impact on the epistemological currents sweeping through PCS research, is that within a feminist communitarian model the mission is interpretive sufficiency – as opposed to an experimentalism of instrumental efficiency – that opens up the social world in all its dynamic dimensions (Christians, 2005) and takes seriously the multiple interpretations and cultural complexity of lives (Denzin, 1989). In working within the perspective of a feminist communitarian ethics, the interpretive discourse is authentically sufficient when it fulfils three conditions: "it represents multiple voices, enhances moral discernment, and promotes social transformation" (Christians, 2005, p.152).

[98] See Becker (1967) '*Whose side are we on?*' for a landmark article on sociologists and partisanship.

In placing moral order and ethics as a central concern of the research process – as opposed to foregrounding that which the researcher finds virtuous – necessitates "an epistemological approach that stresses interaction and dialogical methodologies, an emancipatory research agenda that takes the sides of the marginalized and oppressed" (Amis and Silk, 2008, p.466). Framed within the work of Paulo Freire (1972), this is an epistemological position that empowers people through the development of a critical consciousness to recognise the ideologies that reinforce the status quo and to act on these critical conditions and relate them to the larger contexts of power in society (see Freire, 1972; Giroux, 2001; Humphries et al., 2000; Truman et al., 2000). In essence, the result is a nonfoundational PCS that is grounded in a 'moral-sacred epistemology' (Denzin, 2002); an epistemology that provides the "basis for research designed explicitly to enable social criticism and engender resistance" (Amis and Silk, 2008, p.468).

5.5.3 Axiological Praxis of Physical Cultural Studies.

Indigenous scholars are leading the way in embracing an ethics of truth grounded in love, care, hope, and forgiveness, and in doing so, attack Western epistemologies and methodologies, request that the academy decolonizes its scientific practices (see Smith, 2006), disrupt traditional ways of knowing, and develop methodologies that privilege indigenous knowledges, voices and experiences (Denzin et al., 2006). Thus, an alliance with the critical strands of qualitative inquiry – and therefore those researchers practising PCS – is inevitable (Denzin et al., 2006). Ironically, as non-indigenous scholars learn how to dismantle, deconstruct and decolonize traditional ways of doing science – what Denzin et al. (2006) term 'letting go' – a backlash against critical qualitative research is gaining momentum. The introduction of new 'gold standards' for reliability and validity (St. Pierre, 2004), the fashion of so-called evidence-based research (Pring, 2004; Thomas, 2005), and the intensified 'rigorous' academic criteria designated by research funding bodies[99] (Silk and

[99] Examples of the research funding bodies: the National Research Council (NRC) in the United States, the Research Quality Framework (RQF) in Australia, and the Evidence for Policy and

Andrews, in press) are examples of this backlash. Interestingly, proponents of evidence-based research "fail to recognize that the very act of labelling some research as 'evidence-based' implies that some research fails to mount evidence – a strongly political and decidedly non-objective stance (Denzin et al., 2006, p.770).

Saukko (2005) makes sense of the three methodological currents in [physical] cultural studies by translating them into "validities". Instead of guaranteeing the "truthfulness" of research or attempting to ensure that reality is accurately described, the three modes of enquiry in (physical) cultural studies[100] "open distinctive perspectives on reality or define truth differently" (Saukko, 2005, p.344). Saukko (2005) proposes an integrative and multidimensional framework, where the hermeneutic or dialogic, poststructuralist or self-reflexive, and contextual validities interlace one another, so that each validity is rendered multidimensional by the other two:

> For example, contextualist analysis of social structures and processes may focus on what these structures "are". Such analysis will be enriched, however, by paying attention to the way in which these social processes may be experienced very differently in particular local contexts (dialogism). It will also benefit from thinking through how the research itself, for its small or big part, influences the processes it is studying (self-reflexivity) (Saukko, 2005, p.344).

Importantly, Silk and Andrews (in press) suggest that by remaining faithful to these 'validities' in each of the connections forged in articulation, the event will be opened up and become more visible, enhancing the instances of interpretation and intervention. Although this multidimensional approach to 'reality' and 'truth' further illuminates the event, given that embracing a 'moral-sacred' epistemology in sports coaching research is a radical departure from established standards for assessing quality, it is pertinent to highlight how quality is determined within the nonfoundational approach. Amis and Silk (2008, p.466) posit that the understanding of research quality in critical qualitative research

---

Practice Information (EPPI) in the United Kingdom. See House (2005) for a detailed discussion of the EPPI standards.

[100] The three modes of enquiry ion cultural studies are the hermeneutics, poststructuralism, and a contextual and realist commitment (Saukko, 2005).

must be reframed; "Quality becomes part of the essence of the research design; it becomes *internalized* within the underlying research philosophy and orientation rather than something to be 'tested' at the completion (foundationalism) or during (quasi-foundationalism) the research".

The criteria for evaluating the quality of critical qualitative research must be based upon a holistic appreciation of the scholarship, "notably the moral and ethical concerns that work to erase any distinction between epistemology, aesthetics, and ethics. Judging work according to some moral or ethical criteria is, of course, subjective" (Amis and Silk, 2008, p.467). Although subjective, research adhering to a moral-sacred epistemology cannot exist in an environment in which *anything goes* (Amis and Silk, 2008), although Silk and Andrews (in press) do hope that the environment of expressing the physical can be a field of play where *anything can happen*. However, judgements must be made pertaining to criteria of evaluation to answer the question, how do we judge 'good' quality PCS? (Silk and Andrews, in press).

Silk and Andrews (in press) posit that perhaps PCS scholars could employ 'aesthetic criteria', 'reflexive criteria', and 'impact criteria' as a means to convince 'academics' that it is scholarship. It is important to reiterate that the need to convince academics that it is scholarship is due to the 'gold standard' for research being ascribed to research that is 'scientific' or 'evidence' based (St. Pierre and Roulston, 2006). It is important to express that the concept of applying criteria to make judgements about scholarly activity "reflects the desire to contain freedom, limit possibilities, and resist change" (Bochner, 2000, p.266)…something that research based within a moral-sacred epistemology aims to challenge. The word *criteria* itself is a term found problematic to some as it separates modernists from postmodernists, foundationalists from antifoundationalists, empiricists from interpretivists, and scientists from artists (Bochner, 2000). Although *criteria* is a contested term:

> It is not that one side thinks judgements have to be made and the other side does not. Both agree that inevitably they make choices about what is good, what is useful, and what is not. The difference is that one side believes that "objective" methods and procedures can be applied to

> determine the choices we make, whereas the other side believes these choices are ultimately and inextricably tied to our values and our subjectivities (Bochner, 2000, p.266).

Bearing in mind the problematic nature of the term *criteria*, the research community does need to agree on standards to comply with their own humanly developed conventions (Bochner, 2000). Numerous scholars have engaged with the tacit desire to authorise and legitimate a set of standards (criteria) for judging nonfoundational qualitative enquiry, whilst attempting to minimise the destructive impact that these *criteria* might have on the ethical and moral issues at the heart of the work (see Amis and Silk, 2008; Andrews et al., 2005; Bochner, 2000; Denzin, 2002; Fine et al., 2000; Harrison et al., 2001; Holman, 2005; Richardson, 2000a; Silk and Andrews, in press). In addition to these considerations, it should also be highlighted that each event subjected to enquiry in PCS will be different, and is therefore likely to be scrutinised (situationally, academically, aesthetically, and morally) in different ways in order to demonstrate "interpretive sufficiency". For the purposes of the current chapter, it is expedient to express the *criteria* against which nonfoundational qualitative scholarly activity in the field of sports coaching can be accountable to. Indeed, application of these criteria may indicate that scholarly activity in the field is held to even more 'rigorous' standards than their more traditional counterparts (Silk and Andrews, in press); what Richardson (2000a, p.254) describes as "high and difficult standards". The five *criteria* that Richardson (2000a, p.254) uses when reviewing papers or monographs are: substantive contribution; aesthetic merit; reflexivity; impact; and, expresses a reality. In addition to these five criteria, it would be appropriate to add a sixth for work grounded in a moral-sacred epistemology; reciprocity (see Christians, 2000; Denzin, 2002; Harrison et al., 2001; Holman, 2005). The words of Richardson (2000a, p.254) are worth remembering here: "Creative arts is one lens through which to view the world; analytical/science is another. We see better with two lenses. We see best with both lenses focused and magnified."

5.6 Practising Physical Cultural Studies: The Methodological Toolbox

This section of the chapter will illuminate, at the methodological level, how to best 'focus' and 'magnify' events in the field of PCS. Applying Denzin and Lincoln's (2000) use of the research bricolage requires an "expansive and flexible methodological arsenal" (Andrews, 2002, p.115). Kincheloe (2001, p.686) illuminates the intellectual power of bricolage through the synergy that emerges in the use of different methodological and interpretive perspectives in the analysis of an artefact or event:

> Historians, for example, who are conversant with the insights of hermeneutics, will produce richer interpretations of the historical processes they encounter in their research. In the deep interdisciplinarity of the bricolage the historian takes concepts from hermeneutics and combines them with historiographical methods. What is produced is something new, a new form of hermeneutical historiography or historical hermeneutics. Whatever its name, the methodology could not have been predicted by examining historiography and hermeneutics separately, outside of the context of the historical processes under examination. The possibilities offered by such interdisciplinary synergies are limitless.

Bearing in mind that Kincheloe (2001) suggests that bricoleurs use any methods necessary to gain new perspectives on objects of enquiry, Denzin and Lincoln (2000) describe the bricoleur as multicompetent, skilled at using interviews, observation, and personal documents. The bricoleur will explore the use of "ethnography, Pinarian currere[101], historiography, genre studies, psychoanalysis, rhetorical analysis, content analysis, ad infinitum". (Kincheloe, 2001, p.687). Through further conceptualisation of the bricolage, Kincheloe (2005) further adds textual analysis, semiotics, hermeneutics, phenomenology, discourse analysis, philosophical analysis, literary analysis, aesthetic criticism, and theatrical and dramatic ways of observing and making meaning as constituting the methodological bricolage – there is little wonder why Kincheloe (2001, pp.690-691) states that "learning to become a bricoleur is a lifelong process".

[101] Pinar's (1975) new way of looking at curriculum, through his notion of currere. Meaning trip or route taken to extend understanding of not only oneself, but of others, through a reflexive cycle.

There is no question that conducting sports coaching research at the interdisciplinary frontier requires the development of expertise in different disciplines and research methodologies. Developing the necessary expertise requires more than a casual acquaintance with the literature of the domain (Kincheloe, 2001), and although Denzin and Lincoln (2005b) intimate that the researcher-as-methodological bricoleur should have a working familiarity with a broad range of methods of collecting and analysing empirical materials, it is not feasible to demonstrate expertise in the whole range outlined by Kincheloe (2002; 2005).

The notion that bricolage views research methods actively rather than passively, indicating that the research methods are actively constructed from the tools at hand rather than passively receiving the 'correct', universally applicable methodologies (Kincheloe, 2005) is an important consideration when practising PCS. Silk and Andrews (in press, p.18) advocate that:

> Choosing among methods relates to who we are (our own forms of partiality and positionality), the process of questioning (what we want to know) and our relationship to our subjects (who we wish to dialogue with, the differences and similarities of our situations). However, and no matter what specific methodological strategies we deploy, if PCS is predicated on making a particular event understandable, we are all going to be in a process of negotiating the I-Thou dialogue that is fundamental in all research. That is, there exists a continuum of methodological strategies…all of which involve recognition of the nature and differences and forms of power that circle around the self and other.

For practicing PCS the methods then are critical, self-reflexive, and dialogic, involving dialogue "between the researching self and sources of different kinds" and an internal dialogue that happens "within the researcher" (Johnson et al., 2004, p.77). Silk and Andrews (in press) contend that certain methodological approaches, ground within a moral-sacred epistemology, are better suited to dealing with the most pressing social issues[102] of our time, and therefore afford the preferred 'lens' through which to consider the wider role for sport and concomitantly sports coaching. Consideration in the previous chapter was given

[102] From health and healing, human rights and cultural survival, environmentalism, violence, war, genocide, immigration, poverty, racism, equality, justice and peace (Silk and Andrews, 2007).

to the need for the reconceptualised 'theme field' of sports coaching research to establish a programmatic research line that is sympathetic to the wider externalities presented by sport, which in turn would meet the desire to create a holistic understanding of the sports coaching process, and a fuller understanding of its complexity (Jones et al., 2002; Trudel and Gilbert, 2006). Indeed, the multi-method approach adopted by PCS toward engaging the empirical is not just through *(auto)biographical* or *(auto)ethnographic* methods. Silk and Andrews (in press) contend that PCS is ideally suited to various forms of ethnographic methods, such as *performance ethnographies* or *public ethnography*[103], and that practitioners – the bricoleurs – should make use of newer and perhaps more *avant garde* approaches. This could mean a contextualism in *textual 'readings'* (film, television, written, electronic media) to reveal relations of power, *participatory action research*[104] that decentres the power of the researcher, and that *meetings* – including *the interview*[105], *thematic interview*, *postmodern interview* and *focus groups*[106], and the longer, less structured conversations that are a feature of *oral and life history* – demonstrate an awareness of the self and relations to others.

5.7 Expressing and (Re)presenting Physical Cultural Studies

The nonfoundationalist position that there can be no theory-free knowledge and that relativism is consequently inevitable has implications for the (re)presentation of qualitative work:

> As opposed to efforts to discover reality, the metaphysics of relativism assumes that there are multiple realities and that understanding is created by the combined efforts of the researcher, those being studied, and indeed the interpretations of the reader. Furthermore, a moral-sacred epistemology involves collectively deciding on relevant research

[103] See Holman (2005) for an insightful look at (auto)ethnography and performative praxis: autoethnography as a politics (full) of possibility.
[104] See Kemmis and McTaggart (2005) for its use in a reconceptualised research, research itself as a social practice.
[105] See Fontana and Frey (2005) for an insightful discussion regarding 'killing' metaphorically traditional interviewing.
[106] See Kamberelis and Dimitriadis (2005) for a conceptual and transdisciplinary exploration of the complex and multifaceted phenomena of focus group research.

> questions, jointly determining appropriate data collection methods, and collaboratively analyzing and communicating the results (Amis and Silk, 2008, p.470).

As with the methodological choices, there is no prescribed way to express, (re)present, and ultimately communicate PCS scholarship. As nonfoundationalist scholars recognise the power imbalances inherent in the research process – terms such as *researcher* and *research subject*, *interviewer* and *interviewee* clearly indicate where the power lies in the research process – then they will be cognisant to the influence that this has on work produced through such a lens and therefore on how it has traditionally been reported. A change in the investigative and theoretical perspectives may necessitate a need for alternative forms of reporting (Rouse and Daellenbach, 1999) and, thus, "ontological, epistemological, and methodological advances *must* be accompanied by similar advances in expression" (Amis and Silk, 2008, p.470 – emphasis added). These thoughts are reinforced by Gergen and Gergen (2002, p.14), who note that the emergence of experimental alternatives to traditional writing in qualitative inquiry encourages researchers to "break away from the conventions of social science inscription to experiment with polyvocality, poetry, pastiche, performance, and more". Numerous scholars allied to this thinking have proposed alternate modes of expression, for example: literary (Bruni, 2006), or performative constructions (Atkinson and Hammersley, 1994) such as art and photography (Cohen et al., 2006); ethnography as drama, fiction, or poetry (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005a; Lather, 1991; Richardson, 1993; Van Maanen, 1988).

Stimulated by the crisis in representation as described by Denzin and Lincoln (2000), there has also been a growing interest among a small but significant group of qualitative researchers in the domains of sport, sport coaching and physical education regarding representational issues (Sparkes et al., 2003). "New territories of expression; [that] also offer new spaces of relationship" (Gergen and Gergen, 2002, p.14) being 'experimented' with in the various domains of sport have led to the production of confessional tales, autoethnographies, poetic representations, ethnodramas, and fictional representations (see Denison, 2007; Denison and Markula, 2002; Denison and

Rinehart, 2000; Jones, 2006; Nilges, 2001; Purdy et al., 2008; Sparkes, 2002a; Sparkes, 2002b; Sparkes, 1995; Sparkes et al., 2003; Sparkes and Silvennoinen, 1999).

In the wake of feminist, postmodernist, and poststructuralist critiques of traditional writing practices, science writing prose is no longer held as sacrosanct and qualitative work now appears in multiple venues in a myriad of forms (Richardson, 2000b; Sparkes, 2003). The enlarged, blurred ethnographic genre that includes poetry, drama, conversations, reader's theatre, amongst others, has been termed *creative analytic practice ethnography* by Richardson (2000b), to include work "wherever the author has moved outside conventional social scientific writing" (Richardson, 2000b, p.929). However, it should be remembered that "writing is…the main form of communication in humanities and social sciences and is still – despite the growth of work in video, photography, performance and film – the dominant medium in [physical] cultural studies" (Johnson et al., 2004, p.78).

In expressing PCS scholarship, the inclusion of multiple voices of those being represented, and a rejection of the authoritative, realist, and objectivist style of writing ethnography is a central concern (James et al., 1997)[107]:

> Many of us do ethnography but write in the conservative voice of science…In short, we often render our research reports devoid of human emotion and self-reflection. As ethnographers we experience life but write science (Krizek, 1998, p.93).

In aligning with what Richardson (2000b) terms *creative analytic practice ethnography*, it seems as if the call to tell stories that matter (Clegg, 2002) in a manner that distinguishes it from the outdated 'written' product, enriches the possibilities of dialogue across boundaries. Silk and Andrews (in press) hope that the democratisation of writing practices will also open the field of study to those scholars who have been unable, or barred, from finding a home, or sitting

[107] See Clifford and Marcus's (1986) '*Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography*' for a landmark paper that emphasises the 'literary' turn in the expression of qualitative research.

uncomfortably, within our disciplinary corridors[108]. In respect to opening up the field through the democratising of writing practices, it is not just those from the so-called 'minority' groups that would enhance the sports coaching bricolage. Other voices from those stakeholders in the coaching practice – in addition to the traditional representations of coach and performance athlete who have been the primary focus of scholarly activity – would have a chance to be heard, such as parent, official, performance director, coach employers, social worker, community coach, volunteer coach, sports science support subdisciplinarians (nutritionist, biomechanist, physiotherapists etc.), teacher, and politician, amongst many others. When combining these 'unheard' voices with the 'minority' groups, then there is the possibility of being able to represent the complexity of the theme field of sports coaching research. In addition to this, further opportunity is afforded in the theme field of sports coaching to address the theory-practice gap alluded to by Trudel and Gilbert (2006) by representing or expressing sports coaching research in a manner that is accessible to coaching practitioners and those with an interest in the practice of coaching, and not necessarily written primarily for a scientific audience.

5.8 *Limitations* of a Physical Cultural Studies Sensibility: A 'Decorative Sociology'?

Although it is not the purpose of this section to provide a comprehensive critique of those practising [physical] cultural studies[109], it would be amiss not to map out some of the key issues that surround the cultural turn. Even proponents of the cultural turn are cognisant with the critique of superficiality that is presented; indeed Grossberg (1997b, p.344) notes that it is important to recognise "that not everything is cultural studies, that the field is not entirely open". Andrews (2002, p.110) explicates some of the major issues surrounding scholarly activity by those professing to do [physical] cultural studies of sport:

[108] Those from lower and middle classes, from women, from openly gay and lesbian scholars, from minority, hybrid as well as Third and Fourth world scholars.
[109] For a useful critique of 'decorative sociology' see Rojek and Turner (2000) 'Decorative sociology: towards a critique of the cultural turn'.

> For among sport scholars, it is not uncommon for devotees to display an unconvincing and/or ill-informed comprehension of the cultural studies project that they profess drives their scholarship. All too often, the trite appropriation of cultural studies is manifest in what Gottdiener (2000, p.7) referred to as the reductive forcing of "complex conceptions into simple catchwords" and the resultant trivialization of the approach to all and sundry. At an even more extreme level of misappropriation, cultural studies is also used as an empty metaphor, a bland descriptor of any study focused on sport as part of the cultural realm. Given such superficial and dubious appropriations there is a very real danger that among sport scholars, cultural studies is reduced to being a caricatured and banal intellectual practice.

The trivialisation, misappropriation and superficiality evident in those professing to *do* [physical] cultural studies has led to descriptions of [physical] cultural studies as little more than a 'decorative sociology' (Rojek and Turner, 2000). As an alternative to the role model of the organic intellectual espoused in the cultural studies tradition, Rojek and Turner (2000) argue that the attempt to secure the social requires a particular political orientation, termed 'engaged detachment'. Rojek and Turner (2000) cite the drift from "an academic to an instrumental attitude" (Said, 1978, p.246) to social analysis, that Said (1978, p.328) associates with what he terms "the social degradation of knowledge". The same charge is made of decorative sociology and the cultural turn:

> We hold that the concept of the organic intellectual prejudges the relation of the intellectual to the object of study because it connects the ultimate goal of study with emancipatory politics. We argue for a more reflexive intellectual engagement with politics, which engages with embodiment and emplacement as the fundamental categories of action (Rojek and Turner, 2000, p.644).

The call for 'engaged detachment' contrasts starkly with the need for PCS researchers to be 'political intellectuals' (Grossberg, 2006) and to 'take sides' (Denzin, 2002) and for the knowledge produced to intervene in the broader social world and 'make a difference' (Andrews, 2008). Indeed, 'engaged detachment' of intellectual work stands firmly against the need for intellectual life to dissent against the status quo and runs the risk that intellectuals could be mistaken for an anonymous functionary or a careful bureaucrat (Said, 1994). Rojek and Turner (2000) allude to the motivation of privileging theory and textual approaches in social and cultural analysis as being a reflection of the shortage of real research

funding in the social sciences and humanities…whilst choosing to ignore the emancipatory and transformative praxis of [physical] cultural studies:

> To put it provocatively, the academic star system in cultural studies, media studies, communication studies and the sociology of culture, rewards people for exegesis and penalizes them for long-term qualitative and quantitative work. In underfunded and small humanities departments, empirical research will typically involve a part-time research officer reading a sample of texts from the mass media, typically the TV (Rojek and Turner, 2000, p.640).

For Rojek and Turner (2000) the greatest achievement of the cultural turn has been to teach students to 'read politically', however, for some the cultural turn has gained not only a political impetus, but also an empirical and theoretical impetus. There is a need for boundaries to be acknowledged to prevent a "slide into the morass of intellectual incomprehensibility and disregard" (Andrews, 2002, p.111). To prevent the slide, a vigorous dialogue needs to take place between adherents within sociology [of sport] who may view cultural studies very differently in order to delineate cultural studies and thus posit a more rigid and exclusive understanding.

5.9 Conclusion.

This chapter has presented a critical interrogation of the physical as a contextual, interventionist, multi-methodological and interdisciplinary project. In doing so, it appropriates the concept of bricolage (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000) as an extension to the notion of evolving criticality in qualitative research and the need for intellectual integration. Through recourse to Stuart Hall's *Marxism without guarantees*, Andrews' (2002) derivative *sport without guarantees*, and Lawrence Grossberg's *radical contextualism*, this chapter advances an approach that can be characterised as a *sport coaching without guarantees*. A physical cultural studies nomenclature is mobilised in order to excavate and theorise this position, articulating an ontologically complex project grounded in a moral-sacred epistemology that places moral order and ethics as a central concern of the research process. The requirement to evaluate the quality of research that

embraces a moral-sacred epistemology – to ensure "interpretive sufficiency" – necessitates "high and difficult standards" (Richardson, 2000a, p.254) to be adopted. *Criteria* against which nonfoundational qualitative scholarly activity in the field of sports coaching can be accountable to are presented as: substantive contribution, aesthetic merit, reflexivity, impact, expresses a reality, and reciprocity (Christians, 2000; Denzin, 2002; Harrison et al., 2001; Holman, 2005; Richardson, 2000a).

This chapter also highlighted the need for scholarly activity in this area to "break away from the conventions of social science inscription to experiment with polyvocality, poetry, pastiche, performance, and more" (Gergen and Gergen, 2002, p.14) and begin to explore new territories of expression and build upon the work that is pushing the boundaries of academia in the domain of sport by a small but significant group of qualitative researchers. There is 'opposition' to this so-called 'decorative sociology' (Rojek and Turner, 2000), and indeed Silk and Andrews (in press, p.36) do concede that "the scholar may face difficulty with publication, tenure, funding, and may face ridicule from disciplinarians in regard to superficiality, especially when asked to transcend, facilitate and cultivate, at times as yet unimagined, boundary work". However, in explicating a PCS sensibility to be applied to the 'sports coaching bricolage' it is important to note Silk and Andrews' (2001, p.34) suggestion:

> We do not suggest discarding that which currently holds the centre, but *displacing* it as the only *legitimate* form that falls under the narrowly defined banner of scholarship. In this sense we are calling for a plurality of positions, as set of intersecting, yet not necessarily complementary vectors, a messier, challenging environment in which competing ontological, epistemological and political positions exist alongside one another that foster multi-methodological approaches to truly aid us in expanding our intellectual horizons and reaching our responsibilities as academics.

CHAPTER 6: Conclusion

> Do you really believe that the sciences would ever have originated and grown if the way had not been prepared by magicians, alchemists, astrologers, and witches whose promises and pretensions first had to create a thirst, a hunger, a taste for *hidden* and *forbidden* powers. Indeed, infinitely more had to be promised than could ever be fulfilled in order that anything at all might be fulfilled in the realm of knowledge (Nietzsche, 1882, p.300).

> …it is surely essentialist to presume that only women can/should "do" gender; only people of colour can/should do race work; only lesbians and gays can/should "do" sexuality; only women in violence can tell stories of violence (Fine, 1994, p.152).

6.1 Conclusion

It would be amiss to present this conclusion without a word of caution – this research enquiry should be discarded at this point if you are in any way faint of heart; the comfortable, the institutionally secure, the graduate student, those who chip away at critical cultural analysis of sport within 'science' dominated Departments (Silk and Andrews, in press). For embracing a reconceptualised field of sports coaching within a physical cultural studies sensibility:

> …may very well require destabilising self-reflexivity, having conversations with yet to be imagined parties, stepping outside the halls of academe, and, a leaving behind of all that is academically agreeable. It will likely require admitting – for we are not sure that no matter how far our heads may be planted in the sand that we hold on to the sanctity of the University as a place of learning and discovery, if, that is, they ever were – that the institutions we inhabit…are *political* and *corporate* entities that restrict our scholastic horizons (Silk and Andrews, in press, pp.32-33 – emphases added).

The institutional context of this 'moment' – referred to as our 'proto-fascist' present (Giroux, 2005) or the 'pernicious present' (Silk and Andrews, in press) – espouses a methodological fundamentalism that aggressively pushes evidence based research (EBR), policies and programmes (Lincoln and Cannella, 2004)

resulting in research that 'serves policy' as epistemological sovereignty of high science and a nation of researchers locked in to government policy (Denzin and Giardina, 2006; House, 2006; Silk, Bush and Andrews, in progress). Furthermore, in tandem with a methodological fundamentalism, the *daily* growth of the corporate university sees institutes of higher education increasingly commercialised and vocationalised as a source of profit for corporate interest, yet ignores, for the most part, pressing social problems of our time (Giroux, 2001):

> As neoliberalism spreads its ideology, power, and influence over all aspects of society, there is a growing dislike for all things social, public, and collective. As the obligations of citizenship are narrowly defined through the imperatives of consumption and the dynamics of the marketplace, commercial space replaces noncommodified public spheres and the first casualty is a language of social and political responsibility capable of defending those vital institutions and public spaces that expand the rights and services central to a meaningful democracy (Giroux, 2001, p.5).

The purpose of offering this directional purview for the 'field' of sports coaching is not to present a form of scholarship that privileges certain forms of intellect over others, but is concerned with the progressive potential of a 'field in tension' (Silk and Andrews, in press) in which an evolving dialogue surrounding ontology, epistemology, methodology, interpretation, expression, and impact can be held. In essence, this research enquiry does "not suggest discarding that which currently holds the centre, but *displacing* it as the only *legitimate* form that falls under the narrowly defined banner of scholarship" (Silk and Andrews, in press, p.34). Indeed, reconceptualising the 'field' of sports coaching seeks to *displace*, *decentre*, and, *disrupt* the established field of research and result in an environment where *anything can happen*.

It is important to emphasise that the 'nirvana' sought for the environment of sports coaching research where *anything can happen* is not to be confused with an environment in which *anything goes* (Amis and Silk, 2008). Although the borders or boundaries of a reconceptualised 'field' of sports coaching are going to be fluid and malleable, it is of fundamental importance to identify the sites of critical engagement if the intellectual project is to achieve its emancipatory, intellectual, political, and, moral ends. *Sport* is a vague and imprecise noun

(Andrews, 2008), and to alleviate criticism of the conceptual weakness presented by this signifier (Coalter, 2007); it seems prudent to embrace the evolution of *sport* to physical culture and therefore the mobilisation of the nomenclature of PCS. The broader domain of physical culture encompasses various dimensions of physicality – including, but not restricted to sport, exercise, fitness, dance, wellness, health, movement practices, 'Activities of Daily Living' (ADL), recreation, work, and the pedagogic. Each of these 'spheres' incorporates different motivations for, and practices of, organising and regulating human movement and for each of them the *active body* is something that can be experienced (by the instrumental subject) or observed (as a representational object) (Andrews, 2008). In adopting a PCS sensibility, this creates the opportunity for the very essence of a reconceptualised 'field' of sports coaching – with its multiple iterations of experiencing, communicating, instructing, teaching, and learning – to be captured.

Therefore, as a consequence of the impreciseness of the noun 'sport' and also the richer description of the act of 'coaching' afforded by encompassing the motivations and practices of organising and regulating, experiencing and observing, teaching and learning, and, communicating and instructing the active body, it seems critical for the reconceptualised 'field' to move away from the limiting and somewhat misleading terms 'sport' and 'coaching'. It is not enough for this project to merely *adopt* a PCS sensibility. To invoke and paraphrase Silk and Andrews (in press), there is a need for the reconceptualised 'field' to embrace the conceptual underpinnings that understand a physicality focused on bodily movement and activity. By mobilising the terminology inherent in PCS, the term 'physical' more accurately portrays the various dimensions of physicality that congeal to form the complex and diverse cultural space for inquiry, and the term 'pedagogic' more fully explicates the organising and regulating of the teaching, learning, education and instructional approach undertaken in the cultural space. What is proposed then is for the reconceptualised 'field' to replace the limiting and misleading ascribed label of 'sports coaching', and deploy the moniker of the 'Physical Pedagogic Approach' (PPA). The immediate and noticeable impact of ascribing PPA to the 'field' is that it opens up the reconceptualised 'field' to spheres of inquiry that might have

been discarded[110] or not seen as relevant by practitioners under the old moniker of 'sports coaching'. Spheres of enquiry that sit comfortably within the PPA that might have been 'discarded' or left to scholars in other fields of enquiry might be the practitioner attempting to engage older populations in some sort of physical activity to tackle obesity or the practitioner attempting to illuminate the underrepresentation of particular ethnic identities in recreation programmes. Other examples of potential 'events' to be captured in the reconceptualised field could be the practitioner attempting to describe the pressures surrounding gender stereotypes in dance and the practitioner attempting to explicate the broader societal benefits (e.g. crime reduction) of engaging youth in regular exercise regimes, amongst many others.

Throughout sports coaching texts, the intimation is made that at the definitional core of the practice is improving the sporting *performance* of others (Jones, 2005a). For example, Kidman and Hanrahan (2004, p.145 – emphasis added) state that "one of the primary roles of a coach is to help athletes improve their *performance*", whereas Borrie and Knowles (2003) refer to the process of coaching as helping a player/athlete learn and improve a particular skill. Having articulated that the PPA encompasses broader spheres of enquiry that have traditionally been discarded by the 'field', the very essence of PPA – with its multiple iterations of experiencing, communicating, instructing, teaching, and learning – necessitates a radical reconceptualisation of 'performance' as we understand it.

Analogies between teaching and coaching are frequently made. Jones (2005b, p.xiv) articulates that "coaching is fundamentally intertwined with teaching and learning within given situational constraints". Importantly, measuring effectiveness solely against results [performance] "has an impoverishing effect on the education process, sharply narrowing it down to rote learning and teaching predominantly to the test. The test shapes the syllabus and all that happens in the classrooms" (ACSSO, 2009, p.1). Pineau (1994) articulates that educators, and by association sports coaches, have been encouraged to "conceive of themselves

[110] The term 'discarded' is used here to emphasise that the scholarly activity undertaken would be located in other fields of enquiry.

as ‘actors’ engaged in instructional dramas, as ‘artists’ operating on intuition and creativity, and as ‘directors’ who orchestrate learning experiences” (Pineau, 1994, p.6). Therefore, by adapting research in to ‘live performances’ and the cumulative benefits to individuals, families and communities of having those experiences available night after night, year after year, could illuminate a broader base to capture the essence at the definitional core of ‘coaching’ in the PPA. Instead of offering a single, solitary measure of impact – ‘performance’ – which has lead to “an overtly reductive interpretation of something that is multi-dimensional” (Brown and Novak, 2007, p.9), the PPA proposes seven key intrinsic constructs that capture the essence of coaching: Captivation, intellectual stimulation, kinaesthetic (physical) stimulation, emotional resonance, spiritual value, aesthetic growth, and social bonding (Adapted from Brown and Novak, 2007). It is important to remember that not all coaching [pedagogic] episodes should be expected to generate impact across all seven areas. The constructs merely enable the reader to better understand the dimensionality of impacts in the PPA (Brown and Novak, 2007).

Universities have actively positioned themselves within the context of the new economy – a process termed ‘academic capitalism’ (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004) – and are *driving* corporate dispositions (Barnett, 2000a; Clark, 1998; Dimitriadis, 2006). The resultant hyper-professionalism of academics work towards specialised knowledge in the service of funding ‘niches’ (such as EBR) is driving academics to have greater individual responsibility, greater autonomy and a reduction in social responsibility (Dimitriadis, 2006). Embracing a PCS sensibility in the reconceptualised field of PPA research means viewing Said’s (1994) call for ‘amateurism in intellectual life’ sympathetically. Indeed, there is a need to displace the notion of the ‘universal intellectual’ and also the ‘specific intellectual’ and develop Giroux’s (1995) notion of the ‘border intellectual’ who is not constrained by paradigms and disciplinary boundaries. To this, the deployment of the concept of bricolage (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000) signifies the multidisciplinary, interdisciplinarity and intellectual integration necessary for scholarly activity in the reconceptualised field of PPA.

Currently, scholarly activity in the field of 'sports coaching' can be seen to be underpinned by four approaches (Jones, 2005a) – psychological, sociological, modelling, and pedagogical – however, in the reconceptualised theme field of PPA, the *physical pedagogic bricolage*, seeks to avoid the reductionistic, monological, one-dimensional knowledge that results from external impositions of disciplinary boundaries (Kincheloe, 2005). *Bricoleurs* attempt to account for the complex relationship between material reality and human perception (Kincheloe, 2005) by adopting a multiperspectival process – employing methodological, theoretical, interpretive, political, and narrative bricolage – to get beyond the *determinism* of reductionistic notions of macro-social structures (Kincheloe, 2005). In reconceptualising the concept of 'determinancy' and reworking the concepts of 'Marxism without guarantees' (Hall, 1996) and 'sport without guarantees' (Andrews, 2002), a *sports coaching without guarantees* or more accurately redefined, a *physical pedagogic approach without guarantees* allows for a truly contextual sensibility to unpick the complex, multi-layered field. The *physical pedagogic bricolage* engages with the numerous overlapping systems and discourses (for example: economic, political, technological, aesthetic, demographic, regulatory, and spatial) and reflects societies fundamental divisions along hierarchically ordered lines of division (for example: class, ethnic, gender, ability, generational, national, racial, and sexual norms). In meeting the call to draw from a theoretical base that is multidisciplinary, the *physical pedagogic bricolage* could see psychology, sociology and pedagogy supplemented by the academic disciplines of history, philosophy, religion, languages and linguistics, literature, visual arts, applied arts, performing arts, anthropology, area studies, economics, education, ethnic studies, gender and sexuality studies, geography, political science, social work, systems science, health science, journalism, media and communication, and law[111].

Adding to the theoretical eclecticism of the bricolage, each of these academic disciplines include multiple subdisciplinary areas – for example: cultural history, cultural anthropology, Black studies, political history, public finance, child

[111] This list is by no means exclusive of exhaustive.

welfare, social policy, cultural geography, complexity theory, media studies, and sports law – that would further explicate the context and therefore the understanding of the 'moment' or 'event'. Indeed, it is incumbent on the PPA practitioner to remember that the bricolage is a way of naming and organising existing impulses that influence the understanding of the contextual practices of 'sports coaching' [*sic*]. Reworking Kincheloe (2005), the *physical pedagogic bricolage* serves to promote understanding and communication and create structures that allow for a better informed more rigorous mode of knowledge production. Interestingly, it was posited earlier that the intellectual project to reconceptualise the field did not suggest discarding that which currently holds the centre. This humility should not be misread:

> I strongly believe in the power of the [physical pedagogic] bricolage to move the field in a positive direction; it is concurrently important, however, to understand its constructions and limitations in the context of contemporary social research. The appreciation of the complexity of every day life and the difficulty of understanding it brings with it demands humility on the part of the [PPA] researchers (Kincheloe, 2005, p. 332).

Invoking Giroux (2001), PPA practitioners must facilitate the call for cultural workers – academics, journalists, social workers, teachers, lawyers, performance artists, representatives of the media and others – to become 'border crossers' and engage in intertextual negotiations across different sites of cultural production. It is important to remember that using isolated disciplines/subdisciplines does not make for an integrated academic area, and that a collection of cross-disciplinary areas that simply coexist together does not constitute intellectual integration (Gill, 2007). What is needed is the deep interdisciplinarity of the bricolage, for example where the historian takes concepts from hermeneutics and combines them with historiography or historical hermeneutics (Kincheloe, 2001). Not only does the *physical pedagogic bricolage* challenge researchers to undergo a process that is critical, self-reflexive and dialogic – an internal dialogue that happens "within the researcher" (Johnson et al., 2004, p.77) – it also necessitates academics to develop new collaborations and networks, in addition to the theoretical insights to be gained from engaging with previously unimagined disciplines.

These *new circuits of knowledge* (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004) operate at a number of levels in the *physical pedagogic bricolage* to further the understanding of the 'moment'; intellectual integration from dialogue *between* academics from the myriad of cross-disciplinary areas, the engagement of the academics with the multiple iterations of the individual actors involved in the praxis of the PPA (sports coaches or physical pedagogues, instructors, teachers, athletes, parents, officials, dietary advisors, and others), and also engagement at an institutional/organisational level[112].

To demonstrate how this would manifest in the PPA, for example by examining one dynamic [amongst many others] – the coach-athlete relationship – it can be illuminated how contemporary iterations of examining fail to address the power relationship from an athlete's perspective (Purdy et al., 2008). Typically, studies have been from the coach's perspective (Johns and Johns, 2000; Jones et al., 2003, 2004), however embracing the PPA would result in an increase in research that begins to examine the relationship that exists between coach and athlete from an athlete's perspective [amongst numerous other stakeholder perspectives]. Therefore, Purdy et al's (2008) autoethnographic approach is an example in contemporary sports coaching research of work that would be encouraged within the reconceptualised field. Indeed PPA research that deploys autoethnography and other complementary *avant garde* approaches can seek to help in the understanding of sports coaching as a complex, interactive process, being sensitive to the peculiarities, intricacies and ambiguities of coaching (Jones and Wallace, 2005). In doing so, the PPA addresses the oversimplification and unrealistic conceptions that have led to the dissatisfaction of many coaches with sports coaching research (Bowes and Jones, 2006) and thus can also facilitate in breaking down the theory practice gap.

When the deep interdisciplinarity of the *physical pedagogic bricolage* is considered working symbiotically with the *new circuits of knowledge*, the field of PPA affords an opportunity to not only aid the understanding of an 'event' and

[112] For example: Sport England, UK Sport, British Olympic Association, SportsCoach UK, DCMS and others.

thus make it a far more useful piece of research, but can also be used as a tool to aid in the understanding the very populations we are pedagogically interacting with [coaching] and therefore surely, aiding the pedagogic [coaching] process in terms of quality and effectiveness. This is highlighted by the example of pedagogically interacting with children with a minority ethnic identity who are socially disadvantaged, the 'event' is only partially understood unless it is understood in relation say to family life, criminal activity, issues over migration, issues with English as an additional language (EAL), child welfare, school, religious beliefs, social engineering, and others. In explicating 'events' in this way, effectively by eroding the fixedness of the categories, relations and social domains that inform it, the PPA practitioner is *working the hyphen* (Fine, 1994). Reworking Fine (1994), the *physical pedagogic bricolage* is a field of inquiry, into which the PPA practitioner and the 'Others' enter and play with the blurred boundaries that proliferate. In *working the hyphen*, the PPA practitioner must create occasions for a dialogue with the subjects of inquiry about "what is, and is not, 'happening between', within the negotiated relations of whose story is being told, why, to whom, with what interpretation, and whose story is being shadowed, why, for whom, and with what consequence" (Fine, 1994, p.135). In doing this, the PPA practitioner deploys a critical consciousness in relation to the 'moment' or 'event' under inquiry and is therefore capable of unpacking the density of relations and the intersecting social domains that inform it (Frow and Morris, 2000)[113].

The performative power of interdisciplinarity is emphasised by Giroux (2001), who uses the example of how a performance artist – Suzanne Lacy – brought together urban youth and the police in Oakland, California to engage in a dialogue about police brutality and urban youth violence. This is a lesson to educators, academics, and other cultural workers who wish for their work to not simply reflect the world, but to *make a difference*. The importance of this for those academics practising within the reconceptualised field of PPA, is that their work should be defined by being dynamic, vibrant, politically engaged, and

[113] In essence this captures and frames the direction of research in the PPA.

socially relevant – redefining the educator, academic, or *bricoleur* as an 'oppositional public intellectual' (Giroux, 2001).

Applying the *physical pedagogic bricolage* requires an "expansive and flexible methodological arsenal" (Andrews, 2002, p.115) and therefore the *physical pedagogic bricoleur* must be multicompetent and have a working familiarity with a broad range of methods of collecting and analysing empirical materials. *Physical pedagogic bricoleurs* will use any methods necessary to gain new perspectives on objects of enquiry, and might explore the use of interviews, observation, personal documents, ethnography, discourse analysis, content analysis amongst many others, and indeed, they should make use of newer and perhaps more *avant garde* approaches[114]. This sensibility is evident in the manner that scholarly activity, as a result of the *physical pedagogic bricolage*, is expressed, (re)presented, and ultimately communicated. The methodological advances of the *physical pedagogic bricolage must* be accompanied by similar advances in expression (Amis and Silk, 2008), and indeed *physical pedagogic bricoleurs* should break away from traditional modes of expression in the social sciences and experiment with the emerging alternatives such as polyvocality, poetry, pastiche, art, photography, ethnography as drama, fiction, and many more.

However, it should be remembered that writing is still the main form of communication in the social sciences, in PCS, and thus in the PPA (Johnson et al., 2004), so the deployment of the term 'creative analytic practice ethnography' (Richardson, 2000b) – used to frame work where the author has moved outside conventional social scientific writing – would be prudent to guide the *physical pedagogic bricoleur*. Invoking and reworking Haraway (1988) and Fine (1994), moving away from conventional social scientific writing would mean moving away from texts produced with the "god trick" – painting subjects of inquiry from "nowhere". The PPA practitioner, through their expression, (re)presentation and communication, should no longer self-consciously shelter themselves in the text as if they were transparent. They should carry a voice,

[114] Such as performance ethnographies or public ethnographies.

body, race, class, gender, interests, and politics into the texts that they produce. Not only would this facilitate telling stories that matter (Clegg, 2002), but through the democratisation of writing practices (Silk and Andrews, in press), it will further open up the field of PPA research to those scholars who have been unable or unwilling to sit within the established disciplinary boundaries. In essence, it will complement the call for the *physical pedagogic bricolage* to be both multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary, with intellectual integration fostered through the myriad of possibilities afforded by dialogue across boundaries; *physical pedagogic bricoleurs* would become 'border crossers' (Giroux, 2001).

In the context of the 'corporate university' in tandem with a 'methodological fundamentalism' – our 'proto-fascist' present (Giroux, 2005) – there is a need for critical social scientific work that is not only sympathetic to, but embraces the intellectual, political, moral, emancipatory project of PCS. In embracing a PCS sensibility, this research enquiry has posited that the 'field' of 'sports coaching' is reconceptualised as a field of inquiry that moves beyond the limiting and misleading mythopoeic status given to the terms of 'sport' and 'coaching' and embraces the various instances of the pedagogic approaches to physical activity. Practitioners in this new field – the *physical pedagogic bricoleurs* – through critical interrogations into the physical that are grounded in a 'moral sacred epistemology' (Denzin, 2002), must ensure that the performative and utopian impulses to produce research that confronts inequality, places moral order, ethics, and social transformation as central concerns (Giroux, 2001; Silk and Andrews, in press). In seeking a better understanding of both the world views of diverse peoples and the forces of domination affecting individuals, this 'radically contextualist' PPA must be *meaningful* to a range of communities, and *make a difference* (Andrews, 2008; Grossberg, 2006; Silk and Andrews, in press; Kincheloe and McLaren, 2005; Miller, 2001). Reworking Silk and Andrews (in press), what is proposed is an approach that challenges the practices imposed under neoliberal ideology, one that is characterised by a multiperspectival process and a socially and culturally responsive, communitarian, justice-oriented agenda; in essence, the PPA is an approach that can 'do coaching justice'.

6.2 Contribution to Knowledge

By way of drawing together this research enquiry, it would be prudent to summarise to the reader the key elements that contribute to knowledge in the 'field' of sports coaching research. Before bullet pointing these specific components, it should be emphasised that this is the first time that proposed advances in the field of sports coaching have been contextualised within the institutional 'moment' of the higher educational system. In order for scholarly activity to be undertaken in the reconceptualised field, it *must* operate within universities that encourage *creative* effort and the formation of multidisciplinary groupings, resulting in inventive problem nets, research programmes and ideas (Barnett, 2000a). In essence, universities *are* positioned to embrace an approach [the PPA] that stands in opposition to academic capitalism, corporate dispositions and the hyper-professionalism of academics work; PPA is an approach that is attuned to the dimensions of international localism, democracy and social justice. In addition to contextualising the conjunctural moment in which sports coaching research is undertaken, the specific components of this research enquiry that make an *original* and *significant contribution* to knowledge in the 'field' are:

- Embracing the evolution of sport to physical culture in a sports coaching context.
- Proposing that the single, solitary measure of impact for coaching – 'performance' – is replaced by seven key intrinsic constructs that better capture the essence of coaching.
- Deploying to the 'field' of sports coaching the conceptual underpinnings that understand a physicality that is focused on bodily movement and activity.
- Mobilising the nomenclature of PCS in a sports coaching context.
- Justifying adoption of the Physical Pedagogic Approach (PPA) as a reconceptualisation of sports coaching research.

- Explicating the concept of 'bricolage' (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000) to signify the multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and intellectual integration necessary in the reconceptualised field of PPA.
- The deep interdisciplinarity of the *physical pedagogic bricolage* operating symbiotically at a number of levels with the *new circuits of knowledge* (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004) affords a richer understanding of the 'event', the populations, and potentially the quality and effectiveness of the 'coaching'.
- Conceptualising the researcher as *bricoleur* in the PPA.
- Advocating the deployment of an expansive and flexible methodological arsenal including newer and perhaps more *avant garde* approaches.
- Arguing for the same sensibility deployed in the methodology to be evident in expressing, (re)presenting, and communicating scholarly PPA activity.
- In calling for the democratisation of writing practices (Silk and Andrews, in press), it will further open up PPA research to those scholars who have been unable or unwilling to sit within the established disciplinary boundaries.
- Embracing the PPA affords the possibility of addressing the theory-practice gap evident with current sports coaching research.
- Grounding the PPA in a 'moral sacred epistemology' (Denzin, 2002) with a focus on producing research that confronts inequality, places moral order, ethics, and social transformation as central concerns.

REFERENCES

Abraham, A. and Collins, D. (1998). Examining and extending research in coach development. *Quest*, 50, 59-79.

ACSSO. (2009). *Performance pay for teachers* [online]. Available from: http://www.acsso.org.au/ed070612.pdf [Accessed 9 January 2009].

Allison, L. (1993). *The changing politics of sport*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Amis, J.M. and Silk, M.L. (2008). The philosophy and politics of quality in qualitative organizational research. *Organizational research Methods*, 11(3), 456-480.

Anderson, E. (2007). Coaching identity and social exclusion. *In*: J.Denison. (ed.). *Coaching knowledges: understanding the dynamics of sport performance*. London: A&C Black, 24-50.

Andrews, D.L. (2008). Kinesiology's inconvenient truth and the physical cultural studies imperative. *Quest*, 60, 45-62.

Andrews, D.L. (2004). Sport in the late capitalist moment. *In*: T. Slack. (ed.). (2004). *The commercialisation of sport*. London: Routledge, 3-28.

Andrews, D.L. (2002). Coming to terms with cultural studies. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 26(1), 110-117.

Andrews, D.L., Mason, D.S. and Silk, M.L. (eds.). (2005). *Qualitative methods in sports studies*. Oxford: Berg.

Apple, M.W. (2005). Education, markets, and an audit culture. *Critical Quarterly*, 47(1-2), 11-29.

Apple, M.W. (2001). *Educating the "Right" way: markets, standards, God, and inequality*. New York: Routledge.

Atkinson, P. and Hammersley, M. (1994). Ethnography and participant observation. *In*: N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln. (eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 248-261.

Bailey, D. and Hall, S. (1992). The vertigo of displacement. *Ten 8*, 2(3), 15-23.

Balyi, I. (1992). Beyond Barcelona: A contemporary critique of the theory of periodisation. *In*: *Beyond Barcelona*. 4th Elite Coaches Seminar. Canberra: Australian Coaching Council.

Barnett, R. (2000a). University knowledge in an age of supercomplexity. *Higher Education*, 40, 409-422.

Barnett, R. (2000b). *Realising the university in an age of supercomplexity*. Ballmoor: Open University Press.

Barnett, R. and Griffin, A. (eds.). (1997). *The end of knowledge in higher education*. London: Cassell.

Bates, R. (2002a). Administering the global trap: the role of educational leaders. *Educational Management and Administration*, 30(2), 139-156.

Bates, R. (2002b). The impact of educational research: alternative methodologies and conclusions. *Research Papers in Education*, 17(4), 403-408.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Globalization: the human consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Baker, D. Epstein, G. and Pollin, R. (eds.). (1999). *Globalisation and progressive economic policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barker, C. (2000). *Cultural studies: theory and practice*. London: Sage.

Bauer, M., Askling, B., Gerard Marton, S., and Marton, F. (1999). *Transforming universities: changing patterns of governance, structure and learning in Swedish higher education*. London: Jessica Kinglsey.

BBC. (2008). *Tory teaching offer to ex-troops* [online]. Available from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/7640903.stm [Accessed 02 October 2008].

Beck, U. (2000). *What is globalisation?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Becker, H. (1967). Whose side are we on? *Social Problems*, 14, 239-247.

Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse: vol. iv. Class codes and class control*. London: Routledge.

Blair, T. (1998). *The Third Way: new politics for a new century*. London: Fabian Society.

Bleaney, M. (1983). Conservative economic strategy. In: S. Hall and M. Jacques. (Eds.). *The politics of Thatcherism*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Blommaert, J. (1997). *Workshopping: notes on professional vision in discourse analysis.* Wilrijk: Antwerp Papers in Linguistics, 91.

Bloom, M., Grant, M. and Watt, D. (2005). *Strengthening Canada: the socio-economic benefits from sports participation in Canada*. Ottawa: Conference Board of Canada.

Bloom, G., Stevens, D. and Wickwire, T. (2003). Expert coaches' perceptions of team building. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 15(2), 129–143.

Bochner, A.P. (2000). Criteria against ourselves. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6(2), 266-272.

Bompa, T.O. (1999a). *Periodisation training for sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Bompa, T.O. (1999b). *Periodisation: theory and methodology of training* (4th edition). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Bompa, T.O. (1996). *Periodisation of strength*. Toronto: Veritas.

Bone, J. and McNay, I. (2006). *Higher education and human good*. Bristol: Tockington Press.

Borrie, A. and Knowles, Z. (2003). Coaching science and soccer. *In*: T. Reilly and M. Williams. (eds.). *Science and soccer* (2nd Ed.). London: Cambridge University Press.

Bottery, M. (2000). *Education, policy and ethics*. London: Continuum.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). The forms of capital. *In*: A.H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, and A.S. Wells. (eds.). (1997). *Education, culture, economy, society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 46 – 58.

Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (2001). Neoliberal speak: notes on the new planetary vulgate. *Radical Philosophy*, 105, 2-5.

Bowes, I. and Jones, R.L. (2006). Working at the edge of chaos: understanding coaching as a complex, interpersonal system. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, 235–245.

Bramham, P. (2008). Sports policy. *In*: K. Hylton and P. Bramham. (eds.). (2008). *Sports development: policy, process and practice* (2nd Ed.). London: Routledge, 10-23.

Bramham, P. and Henry, I. (1991). Explanations of the organisation of sport in British society. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 26, 139-150.

Bramham, P. and Henry, I. (1985). Political ideology and leisure policy. *Leisure Studies*, 4(1), 1-19.

Brenner, N. and Theodore, N. (2002a). Cities and the geographies of "actually existing neoliberalism". *Antipode*, 34(3), 349-379.

Brenner, N. and Theodore, N. (2002b). Preface: from the "new localism" to the spaces of neoliberalism. *Antipode*, 34(3), 341-347.

Brewer, C.J. and Jones, R.L. (2002). A five-stage process for establishing contextually valid systematic observation instruments: the case of rugby union. *The Sport Psychologist*, 16(2), 139–161.

Brown, A.S. and Novak, J.L. (2007). *Assessing the intrinsic impacts of a live performance*. San Francisco, CA: WolfBrown.

Brown, N. and Szeman, I. (2002). The global coliseum: on Empire. *Cultural Studies*, 16(2), 177-192.

Brown, P. (2006). The opportunity trap. *In*: H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough, and A.H. Halsey. (eds.). (2006). *Education, globalization and social change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 381-397.

Brown, P. and Lauder, H. (2001). *Capitalism and social progress: the future of society in a global economy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Bruni, A. (2006). "Have you got a boyfriend or are you single?" On the experiences of being "straight" in organizational research. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 13, 299-316.

Burgan, M. (2006). *What ever happened to the faculty? Drift and decision in higher education*. Baltimore, MD, John Hopkins University Press.

Bush, A.J. (2007). What is coaching? *In*: J.Denison. (ed.). *Coaching knowledges: understanding the dynamics of sport performance*. London: A&C Black, 3-23.

Carr, D. (2003). *Making sense of education: an introduction to the philosophy and theory of education and teaching*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Cashmore, E. (2000). *Making sense of sports* (3rd edition). London: Routledge.

Cassidy, T., Jones, R.L. and Potrac, P. (2004). *Understanding sports coaching: the social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice*. London: Routledge.

Cerny, P.G., Menz, G., and Soederberg, S. (2005). Different roads to globalization: neoliberalism, the competition state, and politics in a more open world. *In*: S. Soederberg, G. Menz, and P.G. Cerny. (eds.). (2005). *Internalizing globalization. The rise of neoliberalism and the decline of national varieties of capitalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1-30.

Chakraborty, S. and Lahiri, A. (2007). Costly intermediation and the poverty of nations. *International Economic Review*, 48 (1), 155-183.

Chen, K. (1994). Positioning positions: a new internationalist localism of cultural studies. *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique*, 2(3), 680-710.

Chossudovsky, M. (1996). *The globalization of poverty*. Sydney: Pluto.

Christians, C.G. (2005). Ethics and politics in qualitative research. *In:* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. (eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage,139-164.

Clark, B. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Clarke, J. (1991). *New times and old enemies: essays on cultural studies and America*. London: Harper Collins.

Clegg, S.R. (2002). "Lives in the balance": a comment on Hinings and Greenwood's "disconnects and consequences in organization theory?" *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 428-441.

Clifford, J. and Marcus, G.E. (eds.). (1986). Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography. Santa Fe, NM: University of California Press

Coakley, J. (2001). *Sport in society: issues and controversies* (7th edition). New York: McGraw Hill.

Coalter, F. (2007). *A wider social role for sport: who's keeping the score?* London: Routledge.

Coalter, F. (2005). The social benefits of sport: an overview to inform the community planning process, *Research Report*, 98, Edinburgh: Sportscotland.

Coalter, F., Allison, M. and Taylor, J. (2000). *The role of sport in regenerating deprived urban areas*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Cohen, L., Hancock, P. and Tyler, M. (2006). Beyond the scope of the possible: art, photography, and organizational abjection. *Culture and Organization*. 12(2), 109-125.

Collins, M., Henry, I., Houlihan, B. and Buller, J. (1999). *Sport and social inclusion: a report to the department of culture, media and sport, institute of sport and leisure policy*. Loughborough: Loughborough University.

Connell, R. (1985). *Teachers' Work*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Côté, J. (2006). The development of coaching knowledge. *International Journal of Sport Sciences and Coaching*, 1(3), 217-222.

Côté, J., Sammela, J., Trudel, P., Baria, A. and Russell, S. (1995). The coaching model: a grounded assessment of expert gymnastic coaches knowledge. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17(1), 1–17.

Cross, N. and Lyle, J. (1999). *The coaching process: principles and practice for sport*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Cushion, C., Armour, K.M. and Jones, R.L. (2006). Locating the coaching process in practice: models 'for' and 'of' coaching. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 11(1), 83-99.

d'Arrippe-Longueville, F., Fournier, J.F. and Dubois, A. (1998). The perceived effectiveness of interactions between expert French judo coaches and elite female athletes. *The Sport Psychologist*, 12, 317–332.

Dallmayr, F. (2002). Lessons of September 11. *Theory, Culture, and Society*, 19(4), 137-145.

Darder, A. and Mirón, L.F. (2006). Critical pedagogy in a time of uncertainty: a call to action. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 6(1), 5-20.

David, M. (2007). Equity and diversity: towards a sociology of higher education for the twenty-first century? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28(5), 675-690.

Davies, B. (2005). The (im)possibility of intellectual work in neoliberal regimes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 26(1), 1-14.

Davies, L.E. (2002). Consumer's expenditure on sport in the UK: increased spending or underestimation? *Managing Leisure*, 7, 83-102.

Dearlove, J. (2000). Globalisation and the study of British politics. *Politics*, 20 (2), 111-118.

De Knopp, P., Engström, L-M., Skirstad, B. and Weiss, M.R. (eds.). (1996). *Worldwide trends in youth sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging knowledge: the university in the knowledge society*. Buckingham: Open University Press and SRHE.

Delanty, G. (1998). The idea of the university in the global era: from knowledge as an end to the end of knowledge? *Social Epistemology*, 12(1), 3-26.

Denison, J. (2007). Social theory for coaches: a Foucauldian reading of one athlete's poor performance. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 2(4), 369-383.

Denison, J. and Markula, P. (2002). Introduction: moving writing. *In*: J. Denison and P. Markula. (eds.). *'Moving writing': crafting movement and sport research*. New York: Peter Lang, 1-24.

Denison, J. and Rinehart, R. (2000). Introduction: imagining sociological narratives. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17(1), 1-4.

Denzin, N.K. (2004). The war on culture, the war on truth. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 4(2), 137-142.

Denzin, N.K. (2003). *Performative ethnography: critical pedagogy and the politics of culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N.K. (2002). Cultural studies in America after September 11th, 2001. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 2, 5-8.

Denzin, N.K. (1997). *Interpretive ethnography: ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Thousand oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N.K. (1989). *Interpretive biography*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2005a). The art and practices of interpretation, evaluation, and representation. *In:* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. (eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 909-914.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2005b). Methods of collecting and analyzing empirical materials. *In:* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. (eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 641-650.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2000). Introduction: the discipline and practice of qualitative research. *In:* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. (eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1-28.

Denzin, N.K., Lincoln, Y.S. and Giardina, M.D. (2006). Disciplining qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(6), 769-782.

Denzin, N.K. and Giardina, M.D. (eds.). (2006). *Qualitative inquiry and the conservative challenge: confronting methodological fundamentalism*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). (2008). *Before, during and after: making the most of the London 2012 Games*. London: DCMS.

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). (2006a). *Sport: Coaching* [online]. Available from: www.culture.gov.uk/sport/coaching.htm [Accessed 19 April 2006].

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). (2006b). *Sport: Coaching* [online]. Available from: www.culture.gov.uk/sport/coaching.htm [Accessed 24 July 2006].

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). (2006c). *UK Sport press release* [online]. Available from: www.culture.gov.uk/global/press_notices/archive_2006/dcms_uksport.htm [Accessed 19 April 2006].

Department for Culture, Media and Sport and the Strategy Unit. (2002). *Game plan: a strategy for delivering government's sport and physical activity objectives*. London: Cabinet Office.

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). (2000). *A sporting future for all*. London: DCMS.

Department for Education and Skills. (2003). *The future of higher education*. London: HMSO.

Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference* (A. Bass, ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dick, F.W. (1989). *Sports training principles* (2nd edition). London: A&C Black.

Dimitriadis, G. (2006). On the production of expert knowledge: revisiting Edward Said's work on the intellectual. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 27(3), 369-382.

DIUS. (2007a). *The functions of the new department* [online]. Available from: http://www.dius.gov.uk/functions.htm [Accessed 17 August 2007].

DIUS. (2007b). *The role of the new department* [online]. Available from: http://www.dius.gov.uk/role.htm [Accessed 17 August 2007].

DIUS. (2007c). *Increased support for students in higher education* [online]. Available from: http://www.dius.gov.uk/pressreleases/press-release-20070705.htm. [Accessed 16 August 2007].

Douge, B. and Hastie, P. (1993). Coach effectiveness. *Sport Science Review*, 2, 14-29.

DuGay, P., Hall, S., Janes, L., Mackay, H. and Negus, K. (1997). *Doing cultural studies: the story of the Sony Walkman*. London: Sage.

DWP. (2007). *Working for children*. London: HMSO.

Etzkowitz, H.A., Webster, A., and Healey, P. (1998). *Capitalizing knowledge: new interactions of industry and academe*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Evans, M. (2005). Neoliberalism and policy transfer in the British competition state: the case of welfare reform. *In*: S. Soederberg, G. Menz, and P.G. Cerny. (eds.). (2005). *Internalizing globalization. The rise of neoliberalism and the decline of national varieties of capitalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 69-89.

Evans, M. (2004/5). *Killing thinking: the death of the universities*. London: Continuum.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: reinventing self and other in qualitative research. *In:* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. (eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 70-82.

Fine, M., Weis, L., Weseen, S. and Wong, L. (2000). For whom? Qualitative research, representations and social responsibilities. *In:* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. (eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 167-207.

Fontana, A. and Frey, J.H. (2005). The interview: from neutral stance to political involvement. *In:* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. (eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 695-727.

Foucault, M. (1997). *The politics of truth*. New York: Semiotext(e).

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1977). Intellectuals and power: a conversation between Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze. *In*: D.F. Bouchard. (ed.). *Language, counter-memory, practice: selected essays and interviews*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 205-217.

Foucault, M. (1969). *The Archaeology of Knowledge.* A. M. Sheridan Smith. (trans.). 1972. New York: Pantheon.

Fowler, F.C. (1994). The international arena: The global village. *In*: J.D. Scribner and D.H. Layton. (eds.). (1995). *The study of educational politics*. London: Falmer.

Frank, D.J. and Gabler, J. (2006). *Reconstructing the university: worldwide shifts in academia in the 20th century*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Fréchette, L. (2000). *Opening address of the World Sport's Forum* [online]. Available from: http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2000/20000317.dsgsm88.doc.html [Accessed 6 June 2008].

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Frith, S. (2001). Checking the books: what are universities for? *Critical Quarterly*, 43(1), 88-93.

Friedman, S. (1998). (Inter) disciplinarity and the question of the women's studies Ph.D. *Feminist Studies*, 24(2), 301-325.

Frow, J. and Morris, M. (2000). Cultural studies. *In:* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. (eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 315-346.

Fukuyama, F. (1989). The end of history? *The National Interest*, 16 (Summer), 3-18.

Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man standing*. London: Penguin.

Gamble, A. (1988). *The free economy and the strong state*. London: Macmillan.

Gergen, M. and Gergen, K. (2002). Ethnographic representation as relationship. In: A. Bochner and C. Ellis. (eds.). *Ethnographically speaking*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 11-33.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. and Trow, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.

Giddins, A. (1998). *The third way*. Cambridge: Polity.

Gilbert, W., Côté, J., and Mallett, C. (2006). The talented coach: developmental paths and activities of successful sport coaches. *International Journal of Sport Sciences and Coaching*, 1(1), 69-76.

Gilbert, W. and Trudel, P. (2004a). Analysis of coaching science published from 1970-2001. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 75 (4), 388-399.

Gilbert, W. and Trudel, P. (2004b). The role of the coach: how model youth team sport coaches frame their roles. *The Sport Psychologist*, 18, 21–43.

Gill, D.L. (2007). Integration: the key to sustaining kinesiology in higher education. *Quest*, 59(3), 270-286.

Gill, S. (1995). Globalisation, market civilisation and disciplinary neoliberalism. *Millennium*, 24, 399-423.

Giroux, H.A. (2008). The militarization of US higher education after 9/11. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 25(5), 56-82.

Giroux, H.A. (2005a). *The terror of neoliberalism: authoritarianism and the eclipse of democracy*. Boulder and London: Paradigm Publishers.

Giroux, H.A. (2005b). The terror of neoliberalism: rethinking the significance of cultural politics. College Literature, 32(1), 1-19.

Giroux, H.A. (2004a). War talk, the death of the social, and disappearing children: remembering the other war. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 4(2), 206-211.

Giroux, H.A. (2004b). Beyond belief: religious fundamentalism and cultural politics in the age of George W. Bush., *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 4(4), 415-425.

Giroux, H.A. (2003). *Public spaces, private lives: democracy beyond 9/11*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Giroux, H.A. (2002). Terrorism and the fate of democracy after September 11th. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 2(1), 9-14.

Giroux, H.A. (2001). Cultural studies as performative politics. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 1(1), 5-23.

Giroux, H.A. (2000). Public pedagogy as cultural politics: Stuart hall and the 'crisis' of culture. *Cultural Studies*, 14(2), 341-360.

Giroux, H.A. (1999). *Corporate culture and the attack on higher education and public schooling*. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Fastback 442.

Giroux, H.A. (1995). Is there a place for cultural studies in colleges of education? *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 17(2), 127-142.

Goldberg, M. (2006). *Kingdom coming: the rise of Christian nationalism*. New York, W.W. Norton.

Goldenberg, M.J. (2006). On evidence and evidence-based medicine: lessons from the philosophy of science. *Social Science and Medicine*, 62, 2621-2632.

Greenaway, D. and Haynes, M. (2003). Funding higher education in the UK: the role of fees and loans. *The Economic Journal*, 113 (February), 150-166.

Grossberg, L. (2006). Does cultural studies have futures? Should it? (or what's the matter with New York?): cultural studies, contexts and conjunctures. *Cultural Studies*, 20(1), 1-32.

Grossberg, L. (1997a). Cultural studies, modern logics, and theories of globalisation. *In:* A. McRobbie. (ed.). *Back to reality? Social experience and cultural studies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 7-35.

Grossberg, L. (1997b). *Bringing it all back home: essays on cultural studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Grossberg, L. (1992). *We gotta get out of this place: popular conservatism and postmodern culture*. New York: Routledge.

Grossberg, L. (1989). The circulation of cultural studies. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 6(4), 413-420.

Grubb, N.W. and Lazerson, M. The globalization of rhetoric and practice: the education gospel and vocationalism. *In*: H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough and A.H. Halsey. (eds.). (2006). *Education, globalization and social change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 295-307.

The Guardian. (2008). *Postgraduate course search 2008* [online]. Available from: http://guardian.uk.studylink.com/results/results.html?page=1&keywords=sport&levels-of-study=&study-locations=&subject-areas=&courses-per-page=25&results-list-mode=summary-of-courses-by-provider [Accessed 13 May 2008].

Haleem, H., Jones, R.L., Potrac, P. (2004). Investigating the coach-athlete relationship: The case for autoethnography. In J. Wright. (ed.). *Researching in sport, physical and health education.* Wollongong, Australia: University of Wollongong Press, 93-104.

Hall, S. (1996). The problem with ideology: Marxism without guarantees. *In:* D. Morley and K-H. Chen. (eds.). *Stuart Hall: critical dialogues in cultural studies*. London: Routledge, 25-46.

Hall, S. (1985). Signification, representation, ideology: Althusser and the post-structuralist debates. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 2, 91-114.

Hall, S. (1983). The great moving right show. *In*: S. Hall and M. Jacques. (Eds.). *The politics of Thatcherism*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hall, S. (1981). Notes on deconstructing "the popular". *In:* R. Samuel. (ed.). *People's history and socialist history*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 227-240.

Halsey, A.H. and Webb, J. (eds). (2000). *Twentieth century British social trends*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Halsey, A.H., Lauder, H., Brown, P. and Wells, A.S. (eds.). (1997). *Education, culture, economy, society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hamilton, E. and Cairns, H. (eds.). (1961). *Plato: the collected dialogues.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hammersley, M. (2000). *Taking sides in social research: essays on partisanship and bias*. London: Routledge.

Haraway, D.J. (1988). Situated knowledges: the science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14, 575-599.

Hardt, M., and Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Harper, D. (1987). *Working knowledge: skill and community in a small shop*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Harrison, J., MacGibbon, L. and Morton, M. (2001). Regimes of trustworthiness in qualitative research: the rigors of reciprocity. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(3), 323-345.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hastie, P.A. (1992). Towards a pedagogy of sports coaching: research directions for the 1990s. *International Journal of Physical Education*, 29(3), 26-29.

Haywood, L., Kew, F. and Bramham, P. (1995). *Understanding leisure*. Cheltenham: Stanley Thornes.

Henry, I. (2001). *The politics of leisure policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Hinings, C.R. and Greenwood, R. (2002). Disconnects and consequences in organization theory? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, 411-421.

Hirst, P. and Thompson, G. (1999). *Globalisation in question* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

HMCS. (2007). *Working together: annual report and accounts 2006/07*. London: HMSO.

Hobsbawm, E. (2005). *In defence of history* [online]. The Guardian. Available from: http://books.guardian.co.uk/news/articles/0,,1391079,00.html [Accessed 11 July 2007].

Hodge, M. (2002). Labour's plans for lifelong learning in the second term. *Speech by Margaret Hodge, MP at The Social Market Foundation*, London, 11 April.

Holman J. S. (2005). Autoethnography: making the personal political. *In*: N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln. (eds.). *The Sage handbook of qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 763-791.

Horak, R. and Spitaler, G. (2003). Sport space and national identity: soccer and skiing as formative forces: on the Austrian example. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46, 1506-1518.

Horne, J. and Manzenreiter, W. (2006). An introduction to the sociology of sports mega-events. *The Sociological Review*, 54 (2), 1-24.

Houlihan, B. (2005). Public sector sport policy. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 40 (2), 163-185.

Houlihan, B. (2004). Sports globalisation, the state and the problem of governance. *In*: T. Slack. (ed.). (2004). *The commercialisation of sport*. London: Routledge, 52-71.

Houlihan, B. (1994). *Sport and international politics*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.

Houlihan, B. (1991). *Government and the politics of sport*. London: Routledge.

Houlihan, B. and White, A. (2002). *The politics of sport development: development of sport or development through sport?* London: Routledge.

House, E.R. (2006). Methodological fundamentalism and the quest for control(s). *In*: N.K. Denzin and M.D. Giardina. (eds.). *Qualitative inquiry and the conservative challenge: confronting methodological fundamentalism*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 93-108.

House, E.R. (2005). Qualitative evaluation and changing social policy. *In*: N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln. (eds.). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1069-1081.

Humphries, B., Mertens, D.M. and Truman, C. (2000). Arguments for an emancipatory research paradigm. *In*: C. Truman, D.M. Mertens and B. Humphries. (eds.). *Research and inequality*. London: UCL Press, 3-24.

Hytten, K. (2006). Education for social justice: provocations and challenges. *Educational Theory*, 56(2), 221-236.

The Independent. (2007). *Why Fifa's claim of one billion TV viewers was a quarter right* [online]. Available from: http://www.independent.co.uk/sport/football/news-and-comment/why-fifas-claim-of-one-billion-tv-viewers-was-a-quarter-right-438302.html [Accessed 6 June 2008].

Ingham, A.G. (1997). Toward a department of physical cultural studies and an end to tribal warfare. *In*: J. Fernandez-Balboa. (ed.). *Critical postmodernism in human movement, physical education, and sport*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 157-182.

Jackson, S.J. and Ponic, P. (2001). Pride and Prejudice: reflecting on sport heroes, national identity, and crisis in Canada. *Sport in Society*, 4(2), 43-62.

Jacques, M. (1983). Thatcherism – Breaking out of the impasse. *In*: S. Hall and M. Jacques. (Eds.). *The politics of Thatcherism*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

James, A., Hockey, J. and Dawson, A. (eds.). (1997). *After writing culture: epistemology and praxis in contemporary anthropology*. London: Routledge.

Jarvie, G. (2006). *Sport, culture and society: an introduction*. London: Routledge.

Jessop, B. (2002). Liberalism, neoliberalism, and urban governance: a state-theoretical perspective. *Antipode*, 34(3), 452-472.

Johns, D.P. and Johns, J.S. (2000). Surveillance, subjectivism and technologies of power: an analysis of the discursive practice of high-performance sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 35(2), 219-234.

Johnson, S. (1998). Skills, Socrates and the Sophists: learning from history. *British Journal of Education Studies*, 46, 201-214.

Johnson, R., Chambers, D., Tincknell, E. and Raghuram, P. (2004). *The practice of cultural studies*. London: Sage.

Jones, R.L. (2007). Coaching redefined: An everyday pedagogical endeavour. *Sport, Education and Society*, 12(2), 159-174.

Jones, R.L. (2006). Dilemmas, maintaining 'face' and paranoia: An average coaching life. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(5), 1012-1021.

Jones, R.L. (2005a). *Higher education academy network for hospitality, leisure, sport and tourism: resource guide to sports coaching*. Available from: www.hlst.heacademy.ac.uk/Resources/coaching.pdf [Accessed 10 April 2006]

Jones, R.L. (ed.) (2005b). *The sports coach as educator: reconceptualising sports coaching*. London: Routledge.

Jones, R.L. (2000). Toward a sociology of coaching. *In*: R.L. Jones and K.M. Armour. (eds.). (2000). *Sociology of sport: theory and practice*. London: Pearson, 33-43.

Jones, R.L. and Wallace, M. (2005). Another bad day at the training ground: coping with ambiguity in the coaching context. *Sport, Education and Society*, 10(1), 119–134.

Jones, R.L., Armour, K.M. and Potrac, P. (2004). *Sports coaching cultures: from practice to theory*. London: Routledge.

Jones, R.L., Armour, K.M. and Potrac, P. (2003). Constructing expert knowledge: a case study of a top-level professional soccer coach. *Sport, Education and Society*, 8(2), 213–229.

Jones, R.L., Armour, K.M. and Potrac, P. (2002). Understanding the coaching process: a framework for social analysis. *Quest*, 54, 34-48.

Kahan, D. (1999). Coaching behaviour: a review of the systematic observation research literature. *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual*, 14, 17-58.

Kamberelis, G. and Dimitriadis, G. (2005). Focus groups: strategic articulations of pedagogy, politics, and inquiry. *In:* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. (eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 887-907.

Kaplan, E. (2004). *With God on their side: George W. Bush and the Christian Right*. New York: New York Press.

Kemmis, S. and McTaggart, R. (2005). Participatory action research: communicative action and the public sphere. *In:* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. (eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 559-603.

Kennedy, V. (2000). *Edward Said: A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kennedy-Wallace, G. (2000). Plato.com: the role and impact of corporate universities in the third millennium. In: P. Scott. (ed.). *Higher education re-formed*. London: Falmer.

Kidman, L. (ed.). (2001). *Innovative coaching: empowering your athletes*. Christchurch, NZ: Innovative Communications.

Kidman, L. and Hanrahan, S. (2004). *The coaching process: a practical guide to improving your effectiveness* (2nd edition). Palmerston North: Dunmore.

Kincheloe, J.L. (2005). On to the next level: continuing the conceptualisation of the bricolage. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(3), 323-350.

Kincheloe, J.L. (2003). Critical ontology: visions of selfhood and curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 19(1), 47-64.

Kincheloe, J.L. (2001). Describing the bricolage: conceptualizing a new rigor in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(6), 679-692.

Kincheloe, J.L. and McLaren, P. (2005). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. *In:* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. (eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 303-342.

Kincheloe, J.L. and Steinberg. (2006). An ideology of miseducation: countering the pedagogy of empire. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 6(1), 33-51.

Klein, N. (2007). *The shock doctrine*. London: Penguin.

Krizek, R. (1998). Lessons: what the hell are we teaching the next generation anyway? *In*: A. Banks and S. Banks. (eds.). *Fiction and social research*. London: Altamira, 89-113.

Labour Party. (1996). *Labour's sporting nation*. London: Labour Party.

Lakoff, G. (2006). *Whose freedom? The battle over America's most important idea*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Laine, T. (2006). Shame on us: shame, national identity and the Finnish doping scandal. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 23(1), 67-81.

Landes, D. (1999). *The wealth and poverty of nations*. London: Abacus.

Larner, G. (2004). Family therapy and the politics of evidence. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 26, 17-39.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.

Lauder, H., Brown, P., Dillabough, J. and Halsey, A.H. (2006). *Education, globalization and social change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lawton, D. (1992). *Education and politics in the 1990's: conflict or Consensus?* London: Routledge.

Leathwood, C. and Hutchings, M. (2003). Entry routes to higher education: pathways, qualifications and social class. *In*: L. Archer, M. Hutchings, and A. Ross. *Higher education and social class: issues of exclusion and inclusion*. London: RoutledgeFalmer, 138-154.

Leathwood, C. and O'Connell, P. (2003). 'It's a struggle': the construction of the 'new student' in higher education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(6), 597-615.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind*. Chicago: university of Chicago Press.

Lincoln, Y.S. (2005). Institutional review boards and methodological conservatism: the challenge to and from phenomenological paradigms. *In:* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. (eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 165-181.

Lincoln, Y.S. and Cannella, G.S. (2004). Qualitative research, power, and the radical right. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(2), 175-201.

Lomas, L. (2002). Does the development of mass education necessarily mean the end of quality? *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(1), 71-79.

Lombardo, B.J. (1987). *The humanistic coach: from theory to practice*. Springfield, Ill: C.C. Thomas.

Lyle, J. (2008). Sports development and sports coaching. *In*: K. Hylton and P. Bramham. (eds.). (2008). *Sports development: policy, process and practice* (2nd Ed.). London: Routledge, 214-235.

Lyle, J. (2007). A review of the research evidence for the impact of coach education. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 1(1), 19-36.

Lyle, J. (2002). *Sports coaching concepts: a framework for coaches' behaviour*. London: Routledge.

Lyle, J. (1986). Coach education: preparation for a profession. *In*: *Proceedings of the 8th Commonwealth and international conference on sport, physical education, dance, recreation and health*. London: E. & F.N. Spon.

Lyotard, J-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: a report on knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

MacLeod, D. (2003). *New universities' record ignored by access plans* [online]. The Guardian. Available from: www.education.guardian.co.uk/Print/0,3858,4644333,00.html (Accessed 29 July 2003).

MacLeod, G. (2002). From urban entrepreneurialism to a "revanchist city"? On the special injustices of Glasgow's renaissance. *Antipode*, 34(3), 602-624.

Magdalinski, T. (2000). The reinvention of Australia for the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 17(2), 305-322.

Maguire, J., Jarvie, G., Mansfield, L. and Bradley, J. (2002). *Sports worlds: a sociological perspective*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Maguire, J. (1999). *Global sport: identities, societies, civilizations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Martin, H. and Schumann, H. (1997). *The global trap: globalisation and the assault on democracy and prosperity*. Sydney: Pluto.

Martindale, R.J.J., Collins, D. and Daubney, J. (2005). Talent development: a guide for practice and research within sport. *Quest*, 57, 353-375.

McLaren, P. (2003). *Life in schools: an introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education* (4th Ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

McLeod, J. (2000). *Qualitative research as bricolage*. Paper presented at the Society for Psychotherapy Research Annual Conference, June 2000, Chicago.

McNay, I. (1999). The paradoxes of research assessment and funding. *In*: M. Henkel and B. Little. (eds.). (1999). *Changing relationships between higher education and the state*. London: Jessica Kinglsey.

McNay, L. (1994). *Foucault: a critical introduction*. London: Polity Press.

Menz, G. (2005). Making Thatcher look timid: the rise and fall of the New Zealand model. *In*: S. Soederberg, G. Menz, and P.G. Cerny. (eds.). (2005). *Internalizing globalization. The rise of neoliberalism and the decline of national varieties of capitalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 49- 61.

McSherry, C. (2006). Building an epistemic regime. *In*: H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough, and A.H. Halsey. (eds). (2006). *Education, globalization and social change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 866-874.

Merton, R.K. (1942). The normative structure of science. In: R.K.Merton. *The sociology of science: theoretical and empirical investigations*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Messner-Davidow, E. (1993). Manufacturing the attack on liberalised higher education. *Social Text*, 36, 40-80.

Miller, T. (2001). What it is and what it isn't: introducing…cultural studies. *In*: T. Miller. (ed.). *A companion to cultural studies*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1-20.

Michie, J. and Grieve-Smith, J. (eds.). (1999). *Global instability: the political economy of world economic governance*. London: Routledge.

Mitchell, M.F. (1992). A descriptive analysis and academic genealogy of major contributors to JTPE in the 1980s. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 11, 426-442.

Moody, K. (1997). *Workers in a lean world*. New York: Verso.

Morse, J.M. (2006). The politics of evidence. *In:* N.K. Denzin and M.D. Giardina. (eds.). (2006). *Qualitative inquiry and the conservative challenge: confronting methodological fundamentalism*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 79-92.

Murray, S.J., Holmes, D., and Rail, G. (2008). On the constitution and status of 'evidence' in the health sciences. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 13(4), 272-280.

Murray, S.J., Holmes, D., Perron, A., and Rail, G. (2007). No exit? Intellectual integrity under the regime of 'evidence' and 'best-practices'. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 13, 512-516.

Nash, C. and Collins, D. (2006). Tacit knowledge in expert coaching: science or art? *Quest*, 58(4), 465-477.

Nietzsche, F. (1882). *The gay science*. W. Kaufmann. (trans.). 1974. New York: Vintage Books.

Nilges, L. (2001). The twice told tale of Alice's physical life in Wonderland: writing qualitative research in the 21st century. *Quest*, 53, 231-259.

Noddings, N. (2007). *Philosophy of education* (2nd ed.). Boulder, Colorado: Westview.

Ohmae, K. (1990). *The borderless world: power and strategy in the interlinked economy*. London: HarperCollins.

Olssen, M. and Peters, M.A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313-345.

Palmer, C. (1996). Information work at the boundaries of science: linking library services to research practices. *Library Trends*, 44(2), 165-192.

Peck, J. and Tickell, A. (2002). Neoliberalizing space. *Antipode*, 34(3), 380-404.

Personneltoday. (2008). *Butlins joins with Chichester University to offer degrees* [online]. Available from: http://www.personneltoday.com/articles/2008/09/01/47265/butlins-joins-with-chichester-university-to-offer-degrees.html [Accessed 16 September 2008].

Pestre, D. (2000). The production of knowledge between academies and markets: a historical reading of the book 'The new production of knowledge'. *Science, Technology and Society*, 5(2), pp. 169-181.

Pinar, W. F. (1975). Currere: toward reconceptualization. *In*: W. F. Pinar. (ed.). *Curriculum theorizing: the reconconceptualists*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, 396-414.

Pineau, E.L. (1994). Teaching is performance: reconceptualising a problematic metaphor. *American Educational Research journal*, 31(1), 2-25.

Poli, R. (2007). The denationalization of sport: de-ethnicization of the nation and identity deterritorialization. *Sport in Society*, 10(4), 646-661.

Potrac, P., Jones, R.L. and Cushion, C. (2007). Understanding power and the coach's role in professional English soccer: a preliminary investigation of coach behaviour. *Soccer and Society*, 8(1), 33-49.

Potrac, P., Jones, R.L. and Armour, K.M. (2002). It's all about getting respect: the coaching behaviours of an expert English soccer coach. *Sport, Education and Society*, 7(2), 183–202.

Potrac, P., Brewer, C., Jones, R.L., Armour, K. and Hoff, J. (2000). Toward an holistic understanding of the coaching process. *Quest*, 52, 186–199.

Pring, R. (2004). Conclusion: evidence-based policy and practice. In: G. Thomas and R. Pring. (eds.). *Evidence-based practice in education*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 201-212.

Pullo, F.M. (1992). A profile of NCAA division 1 strength and conditioning coaches. *Journal of Applied Sport Science Research*, 6(1), 55–62.

Purdy, L., Potrac, P. and Jones, R.L. (2008). Power, consent and resistance: An autoethnography of competitive rowing. *Sport, Education and Society*, 13(3), 319-336.

Quail, C.B., Razzano, K.A., and Skalli, L.H. (2004). *Tell me more: rethinking daytime talk shows*. New York: Peter Lang.

Readings, B. (1996). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Reid, I.A. and Jarvie, G. (2000). Sport, nationalisms and their futures. *In*: R.L. Jones and K.M. Armour. (eds.). (2000). *Sociology of sport: theory and practice*. London: Pearson, 33-43.

Reynolds, B. (2005). Mind the gap between rich and poor. *NICVA Conference: Poverty: will the poor always be with us?* 08 July 2005 Belfast.

Richardson, L. (2000a). Evaluating ethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6(2), 253-255.

Richardson, L. (2000b). Writing: a method of inquiry. *In*: N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln. (eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage, 923-948.

Richardson, L. (1993). Poetic representation, ethnographic presentation and transgressive validity: the case of the skipped line. *Sociological Quarterly*, 34, 695-710.

Riordan, J. and Krüger, A. (1999). *The international politics of sport in the twentieth century*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Riordan, J. (ed.). (1978). *Sport under Communism*. London: Hurst.

Rizvi, F. and Lingard, B. (2006). Edward Said and the cultural politics of education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 27(3), 293-308.

Rojek, C. and Turner, B. (2000). Decorative sociology: towards a critique of the cultural turn. *The Sociological Review*, 48(4), 629-648.

Rose, N. (2000). Community, citizenship and the third way. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 43, 1395-1411.

Rouse, M.J. and Daellenbach, U.S. (1999). Rethinking research methods for the resource-based perspective: isolating sources of sustainable competitive advantage. *Strategic management Journal*, 20, 487-494.

Roy, A. (2003). The loneliness of Noam Chomsky. *In*: A.Roy. (2003). *War talk*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 77-101.

Roy, A. (2001). War is peace. *In*: A. Roy. (2001). *Power politics*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 125-145.

Sagaria, M.A.D. (2007). *Women, universities and change: gender equality in the European Union and the U.S.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Said, E.W. (2003). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.

Said, E. (1994). *Representations of the intellectual*. New York: Pantheon.

Said, E.W. (1983). *The world, the text and the critic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Routledge.

Sam, M.P. and Jackson, S.J. (2004). Sport policy development in New Zealand. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 39 (2), 205-222.

Saukko, P. (2005). Methodologies for cultural studies: an integrative approach. *In:* N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln. (eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 343-356.

Schuster, J.H. and Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: the restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Scott, D. (1999). *Refashioning futures: criticism after postcoloniality*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Shavit, Y., Arum, R. and Menahem, G. (eds.). (2007). *Stratification in higher education: a comparative study*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Sherman, C., Crassini, B., Maschette, W. and Sands, R. (1997). Instructional sport psychology: a reconceptualisation of sports coaching as sports instruction. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 28(2), 103–125.

Silk, M.L. and Andrews, D. (in press). Practising physical cultural studies. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues.*

Silk, M.L., Bush, A.J. and Andrews, D. (in progress). Contingent intellectual amateurism, or, the problem with evidence based research.

Silver, H. (1990). *Education, change and the policy process*. London: Falmer.

Scholte, J.A. (2000). *Globalization: a critical introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Skalli, L. (2004). Loving Muslim women with a vengeance: the West, women, and fundamentalism. *In*: J. Kincheloe and S.R. Steinberg. (eds.). *The miseducation of the West: constructing Islam*. New York: Greenwood, 43-58.

Slack, J.D. (1996). The theory and method of articulation in cultural studies. *In:* D. Morley and K-H. Chen. (eds.). *Stuart Hall: critical dialogues in cultural studies*. London: Routledge, 112-127.

Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: politics, policies and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S. and Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: markets, state, and higher education*. London: John Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., Archerd, C.J. and Campbell, T.I.D. (2004). Boundaries and quandaries: how professors negotiate market relations. *The Review of Higher Education*, 28(1), 129-165.

Smith, L.T. (2006). Choosing the margins: the role of research in indigenous struggles for social justice. *In*: N.K. Denzin and M.D. Giardina. (eds.). *Qualitative enquiry and the conservative challenge: confronting methodological fundamentalism*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast press.

Soederberg, S., Menz, G., and Cerny, P.G. (eds.). (2005). *Internalizing globalization. The rise of neoliberalism and the decline of national varieties of capitalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Sparkes, A.C. (2002a). *Telling tales in sport and physical activity: a qualitative journey*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Press.

Sparkes, A.C. (2002b). Fictional representations: on difference, choice, and risk. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 19, 1-24.

Sparkes, A.C. (1995). Writing people: reflections on the dual crisis of representation and legitimation in qualitative inquiry. *Quest*, 47, 158-195.

Sparkes, A.C., Nilges, L., Swan, P. and Dowling, F. (2003). Poetic representations in sport and physical education: insider perspectives. *Sport, Education and Society*, 8(2), 153-177.

Sparkes, A.C. and Silvennoinen, M. (eds.). (1999). *Talking bodies: men's narratives of the body and sport*. SoPhi: University of Jyvaskylal, Finland.

Sperling, J. and Tucker, R.W. (1997). *For-profit higher education: developing a world-class workforce*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Sports coach UK. (2008). *Research in Sports coach UK* [online]. Available from: www.sportscoachuk.org/research/Research.htm [Accessed 18 August 2008].

Sports coach UK. (2006). *UK action plan for coaching* [online]. Available from: www.sportscoachuk.org/About+Us/UKAPC/introduction.htm [Accessed 20 April 2006].

Sport England. (2007). *Economic importance of sport: summary report England 2003* [online]. Available from: http://www.sportengland.org/england_summary_econ_importance.pdf [Accessed 6 June 2008].

St. Pierre, E.A. (2006). Scientifically based research in education: epistemology and ethics. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 56(4), 206-239.

St. Pierre, E.A. (2004). Refusing alternatives: a science of contestation. *Qualitative Inquir*y, 10(1), 130-139.

St. Pierre, E.A. and Roulston, K. (2006). The state of qualitative inquiry: a contested science. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(6), 673-684.

Stables, A. (2003). *Education for diversity*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Stafford, I. and Balyi, I. (2005). *Coaching for long term athlete development: improving participation and performance in sport*. Leeds: Coachwise.

Steinmetz, G. (2003). The state of emergency and the revival of American imperialism: toward an authoritarian post-Fordism. *Public Culture*, 15(2), 323-345.

Tamboukou, M. (1999). Writing genealogies: an exploration of Foucault's strategies for doing research. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 20(2), 201-217.

Targett, S. (1998). *Government gets its sums wrong over move to charge university tuition fees* [online]. The Financial Times. Available from: http://www.bl.uk/welfarereform/issue1/eduhigh.html [Accessed 6 August 2007].

The Telegraph. (2008). *Premier league wages break the one billion pounds barrier* [online]. Available from: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/main.jhtml?xml=/sport/2008/05/29/sfnpre129.xml [Accessed 29 May 2008].

Thomas, G. (2005). Introduction: evidence and practice. *In*: G. Thomas and R. Pring. (eds.). *Evidence-based practice in education*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1-18.

Tomlinson, S. (2001). *Education in a post-welfare society*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Torrance, H. (2006). Research quality and research governance in the United Kingdom: from methodology to management. *In*: N.K. Denzin and M.D. Giardina. (eds.). *Qualitative inquiry and the conservative challenge: confronting methodological fundamentalism*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 127-148.

Trudel, P. and Gilbert, W. (2006). Coaching and coach education. In D.Kirk, M. O'Sullivan, and D. McDonald, *Handbook of physical education*. London: Sage, 516-539.

Truman, C., Mertens, D.M. and Humphries, B. (eds.). (2000). *Research and inequality*. London: UCL Press.

Trudel, P. (2006). What the coaching science literature has to say about the roles of coaches in the development of elite athletes. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 1(2), 127-130.

Trudel, P. and Gilbert, W. (2006). Coaching and coach education. *In*: D. Kirk, M. O'Sullivan, and D. McDonald, *Handbook of physical education*. London: Sage, 516-539.

Tsang, T. (2000). Let me tell you a story: a narrative exploration of identity in high performance sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17, 44-59.

UCAS. (2008a). *Universities and Colleges Admissions Service course search 2008: sport* [online]. Available from: http://search.ucas.co.uk/cgi-bin/hsrun/search/search/StateId/D07br39hrcW0YsRLbjHORrx7RXdIA-U3KF/HAHTpage/search.HsKeywordSuggestion.whereNext?query=677&word=SPORT&single=N [Accessed 13 May 2008].

UCAS. (2008b). *Universities and Colleges Admissions Service course search 2009: sport* [online]. Available from: http://search.ucas.co.uk/cgi-bin/hsrun/search/search/StateId/D07sFG9hfpY0Yd8AbjH4XQC8RXd8y-VNLf/HAHTpage/search.HsKeywordSuggestion.whereNext?query=677&word=SPORT&single=N [Accessed 13 May 2008].

UCAS. (2008c). *Universities and Colleges Admissions Service course search 2008: sport foundation degrees* [online]. Available from: http://develop.ucas.com/cgi-bin/hsrun.exe/General/FDCourseSearch/StateId/D07rb39hfNK0Ydu5bjHSM6amD1D_1-4qNd/HAHTpage/FDCourseSearch.HsForm.mapFormToCmd [Accessed 13 May 2008].

UNICEF. (2007). *A steady eye on children* [online].UNICEF annual report 2006. Available from: http://www.unicef.org/about/annualreport/files/Annual_Report_2006.pdf [Accessed 16 July 2007].

United Nations. (2005a). *Business plan international year of sport and physical education*. New York: United Nations.

United Nations. (2005b). *The Millennium development goals report* 2005. New York: United Nations.

United Nations. (2005c). *Sport for development and peace: towards achieving the Millennium development goals*. New York: United Nations.

Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field: on writing ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Van Neutegem, A. (2006). Bridging the athlete-coach transition: a reflective note on long-term coach development. *Coaches Plan*, 13(2), 41-46.

Watson, D. (2006). New Labour and higher education [online]. *AUA Conference, Queens University Belfast*, 11 April 2006. Available from: http://www.aua.ac.uk/publications/conferenceproceedings/2006belfast/davidwatson.doc [Accessed 6 August 2007].

Way, R. and O'Leary, D. (2006). Long-term coach development concept. *Perspective*, 24-31.

Wesson, L. and Weaver, J. (2001). Administration-educational standards: using the lens of post-modern thinking to examine the role of the school administrator. *In*: J. Kincheloe and D. Weil. (eds.). *Standards and schooling in the United States: an encyclopaedia*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio.

Weiss, L. (1997a). Globalization and the myth of the powerless state. *New Left Review*, old series 225, 3-27.

Weiss, C.H. (1997b). How can theory-based evaluation make greater headway? *Evaluation Review*, 21(4), 501-524.

Whannel, G. (1983). *Blowing the whistle*. London: Comedia.

Williams, J. (1997). The discourse of access: the legitimation of selectivity. *In*: J. Williams. (ed.) *Negotiating access to higher education: the discourse of selectivity and equity*. Buckingham: SRHE and the Open University Press, 24–46.

Wilson, J. (1994). *Playing by the rules: sport, society, and the state*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Wilson, J. (1988). *Politics and leisure*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Woodman, L. (1993). Coaching: a science, an art, an emerging profession. *Sport Science Review*, 2(2), 1–13.